

JPRS-UPA-89-055
7 SEPTEMBER 1989



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

19980616 051

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-055

CONTENTS

7 September 9

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Deputy Advocates Formation of Two-Chamber Local Soviets [N. Travkin; IZVESTIYA, 27 Jul 89]	1
Legal Committee Head Evaluates First Supreme Soviet Session [S. Alekseyev; NEDEL'YA No 32, 7-13 Aug]	2
Draft Latvian CP Action Program [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 27 Jul 89]	6
LaSSR CP Membership Detailed [KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII No 6, Jun 89]	12
LiSSR CP First Secretary Plenum Speech [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 25 Jun 89]	17
Lithuanian Draft Constitution Discussed [K. Malinauskas; SOBYTIYA I VREMYA No 12, Jun 89]	25

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Conferees Discuss Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact [V. Ivanov; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 13 Jul 89]	29
---	----

RELIGION

Latvian Supreme Court Rehabilitates Cardinal Vaivods [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 15 Jun 89]	35
Church Built By Boris Godunov Conducts Religious Services [I. Serebryakov; MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 6 May 89]	35

CULTURE

Major Journal Editors Describe Publication Plans	36
ZNAMYA Editor Baklanov [G. Baklanov; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 12 July 89]	36
DRUZHBA NARODOV Editor Baruzdin [S. Baruzdin; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 19 Jul 89]	37
OKTYABR Editor Ananyev [A. Ananyev; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 19 Jul 89]	38
Editors of MOSKVA, NEVA Provide Publishing Plans [M. Alekseyev, B. Nikolskiy; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 26 Jul 89]	40
Film Director Ryazanov to Produce 'Chonkin' [E. Ryazanov; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 1 Jul 89]	42
Expenditures of Contributions to Soviet Culture Fund Given [G. Myasnikov; ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 29, 22-28 Jul 89]	43

SOCIAL ISSUES

Reporter Describes Activities of Democratic Union [A. Nikolayev; EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 27, Jul 89]	44
Kishinev Leaders, Workers on Responsibility for 28 June Events [SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 8 Jul 89]	48
Georgians Surveyed on 9 April, Congress of People's Deputies [MOLODEZH GRUZII, 1 Aug 89]	50

REGIONAL ISSUES

Transcarpathian Oblast 1st Secretary on Nationalism [G.I. Bandrovskiy; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 26 Jul 89]	51
Lithuanian Editor Addresses Russians' Stance on Language Issue [A. Gelbakh; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 29 Jun 89]	54
MSSR CP CC Ideology Department on Measures To Improve Study of Moldavian, Other Languages [SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 15 Jul 89]	56
Tajik Language Law Prompts Arabic, Persian, Tajik Textbooks [KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, 8 Aug 89]	58
Young Lithuanians Judge Komsomol [R. Alishauskene; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 1 Jun 89]	58
Balts Comment on Lithuanian Youth Congress	59
First Secretary of Estonian Komsomol [U. Laanem; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 2 Jun 89]	59

First Secretary of Latvian Komsomol	[I. Preditis; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 2 Jun 89]	60
Interethnic Cooperation in Greens' Cleanup Action		
	[A. Ginautayte; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 11 Jul 89]	61
Young Lithuanians from Abroad Participate in Congress	[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 13 Jul 89]	62
Sajudis Chairman Visits Bonn	[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 12 Jul 89]	62
Greens' Parliament Meets	[Yu. Dautartas; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 6 Jul 89]	63
Greens Announce Antimilitarist March	[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 6 Jul 89]	63
Lithuanian Parents Concerned About Military Draft		
	[K. Golubev; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 13 Jul 89]	64
Estonia Simplifies Procedures for Business Trips Abroad		
	[G. Logunov; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 8 Jul 89]	65
LaSSR Economic Autonomy Plan Criticized		66
Goals Linked to National Ideology	[A. Malinkovskiy; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 12 Jul 89]	66
Foundation of Plan Called 'Shaky'	[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 13 Jul 89]	68

Deputy Advocates Formation of Two-Chamber Local Soviets

18001434 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jul 89
Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Nikolay Travkin: "Local Authority Should Have Two Chambers"]

[Text] The further away we are from the first Congress of People's Deputies, the more obvious it becomes that many problems cannot be solved if the change in the supreme power is not accompanied by changes in the local power. The slogan "All Power to the Soviets" should not be associated with the Kremlin Palace of Congresses alone. By shaping the entire pyramid of people's power, we cannot ignore the local soviets which lie at its base. It is the soviets that deal with our everyday needs and requirements. This is seen once again from snowballing complaints and appeals addressed to us, peoples's deputies of the USSR, an avalanche that many advocates of a command and administrative system view with glee as capable of burying us soon. What are all these complaints about? Most often, the problems that can be tackled by a district soviet. Therefore, the supreme central power - Congresses - should map out such a society in which people can resolve the problems locally. For its part, the Supreme Soviet should give it a legal framework. In other words, we mean establishing a people's power.

However, if we limit ourselves to the election of new deputies and view the renovated district and city soviets the base of the pyramid of soviet power in the country,

this pyramid will be found to have no grass roots. As a result, instead of a people's power, we shall have people ruled by people's representatives.

What is to be done then?

I would suggest a two-chambered local soviet. One chamber - the residents' chamber - is to include representatives of the village, rural councils, or where they do not exist, of the newly established public self-rule committees. The other chamber should include representatives of the councils of labor collectives at enterprises, i.e. be industry-wide.

The residents' chamber will formulate the need for a social infrastructure, the producers' chamber will finance the needs of territories through profit sharing and voluntary donations. If the needs do not match the possibilities, a joint session of the two chambers will decide either to restrain the needs until better times arrive (no allocations are made centrally now) or to try to find how to add to the possibilities. This can be done through a higher labor efficiency and the resultant growth in profits and profit sharing, by developing local industries, cooperatives and so on. Self-rule is the force underpinning the suggested structure of local power. Self-rule is a set-up that should come to the rescue of soviet power, both at the place of residence and the work place. What do the councils of work collective stand for? They spell soviet power at enterprises. They should become a fixture of people's power.

Below is a sample of a district soviet, to make my point clearer.

	Chairman of the Soviet	Frequency of Session
5	Presidium of the Soviet	Constant Session
4	Chamber of Residents	No less than once a quarter
3	Village Soviet, Rural Soviet, Public Self-Governing Committee	No less than once a month
2	Street Committee, Building Committee, Housing Construction Cooperative Committee	Twice a month
1	Residents, public organizations, "informals"	When needed

A

B

You might have noticed that unit A includes the dependents and unit B consists of breadwinners. But such structure will rule out a traditional antagonism between them. The very same people both produce material goods and decide how they should be distributed. During the daytime such a person acts as a worker, an engineer or an office worker making money for his territory; in the evening, he is just a resident, who walks down a dirty pot-holed street, or feels uncomfortable in a store, or sees his son hanging about in the corner, because there is no club around. Soviet deputies will hardly need any extra information then when the budget for everyday needs is

put for discussion at the joint session of both chambers of the local parliament. The dependents know perfectly well how much money the breadwinners have in their pockets since it is the same pocket. On the other hand, the breadwinners are well aware of all the bottlenecks.

So, people themselves will define the priorities - what should be done first, what next and what can be done as the last resort. Suppose a local soviet has a 10 million ruble budget, and the needs exceed these resources by far. The producers and consumers of material values should decide where the money should be spent first of

all. Either to build a road so that people do not have to use rubber boots; or to build a hospital, maybe a maternal hospital; or to help a local plant construct a new workshop to speed up the manufacture of goods in high demand. The latter's profits will provide additional resources, of course.

In this way, a machinery to work out a compromise will be put in place. Both social and everyday as well as the problems at work will be handled differently on the regional level. This arrangement will create a democratic method, not the one driven by command or cap-in-hand attitude we have now.

As to the elections, there are no questions regarding the citizen's chamber. The territory is to be divided into electoral districts, as is done now, and the nominated candidates go to the pits. No special issues are involved here. We have different public groups, an increasing number of informal organizations, people's fronts in many areas, and more or less enthusiastic and politically aware citizens. Questions may arise when forming industrial chambers that include councils of labor collectives. How should its representatives be elected?

This is very simple. Both chambers have the same number of deputies. If residents send 50 deputies, the representative of labor collective send the same number. The latter are elected separately, based on a definite quota of one person from a certain number of working people. Collectives can join together for this purpose. This will be followed by the nomination at enterprises (the same way it was done during the current election campaign). Finally, the best candidates will be elected. Thus, an industrial chamber will have its own representatives sent to it by each labor collective, or by several collectives if they are small. The majority of the population will vote twice. Mostly, the working people, i.e. those who feed the territory. A direct representation through a council of labor collectives is feasible as well. The selection of one option or another should be made, in my opinion, through a referendum.

Let's look at the diagram once again and see that power is formed from bottom to top. First, residents, public organizations and informals form their own organs of governance, which can be called self-governing bodies, including street and house committees and so on. Look up now at level 4. A deputy representing a local soviet (level 4) is at the same time a member of the council at level 3, i.e. works there constantly and is subordinated to it. Under such arrangement, if an old woman has a faulty faucet or has no firewood, she would not have to write a letter to Moscow, or go to see the chairman of the executive committee. She can just approach a deputy at her level or its soviet.

The financial means to resolve local problems will be allocated at each level. A city soviet will not have to decide how many sweepers each neighborhood should have and how much they should be paid. This is to be

decided locally. The same principle applies to the selection and performance of personnel, their pay by local service establishments, down to the beat level.

This structure will be conducive to pooling the efforts of such groups as pensioners, young people, informals and others through residence public councils.

The system of councils of labor collectives has been put in place at enterprises, although often as a formality. In the capacity of territorial "breadwinners", the councils will act more seriously and in a more meaningful manner. This work cannot be accomplished independent of grassroot cost accountability, wherein lies the connection between the political and economic reforms.

Right now, many councils of labor collectives are just playthings. Why is it so? Because no genuine cost accountability has been promoted. We continue to live by the distribution-type economy. A particular enterprise may have to rely on profits already, while the ministry still commands a lot of influence. A minister can take away my profits if he or she wants to. But if we embark on self-governance, it is high time the ministries abide by the decisions of the 19th Party conference and the Congress, switching over from commanding links and instructions to contractual and profit-motivated relationship with enterprises. It is possible that this arrangement needs further theoretical elaboration. But if it is to be seen lying at the core of people's power, then the self-governance stages, including the public committees, should be seen as links of soviet power, not as additional levers to motivate people. In this case, the councils of labor collectives become organs of soviet power at enterprises, i.e. become integrated in the political structure, not just an economic one.

Since all these assumptions take care of human needs, the law on local self-governance emerges as a top priority. All other laws and economic measures undertaken by the government should be adjusted to it.

We do not have enough time to elaborate and pass this law at the Congress to be held this autumn. But we can adopt its fundamentals and start implementing them in certain areas and cities beginning in 1990. The rest will be prompted by experience and amendments can be made as we move ahead. We should have accumulated sufficient trial and error experience in the self-governance and financing of local soviets by the time of the 4th Congress. So, starting from 1991, it can be promulgated across the country.

Legal Committee Head Evaluates First Supreme Soviet Session

18001560 Moscow NEDELYA in Russian No 32, 7-13 Aug 89 pp 2-3

[Interview with Sergey Sergeyevich Alekseyev, USSR people's deputy, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Legislation, Legality and Law and Order, by NEDELYA correspondent Aleksandr Yevseyev: "A Beginning"]

[Text] By evening we have already started to sense a certain emptiness—something is missing. What is missing is the usual many hours of television and radio broadcasts for the last 2 months from the first session of our new USSR Supreme Soviet.

We miss the passionate debates without the smooth-talking announcer, and the unexpected revelations of the deputies, and the emotional impromptus. We miss the examples of candidness and conviction, and the directness of the opinions and obligation that illuminated our screens with something that was not part of a large plan. And because our parliament was like a holiday.

The first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet elected by the First Congress of People's Deputies has completed its work-filled mission and is now part of history. It went leaving behind thousands of pages of the stenographic record (there had never before been such a thing in our parliamentary practice) and a whole package of legislative enactments that it had passed. In and of itself this is also an extraordinary fact. Particularly when one knows that it is a question of today's very important and "hot" enactments, such as the law aimed at improving pension provisions, amendments to the law on the state enterprise, and to the ukase on cooperative taxes, and the decree on decisive measures to deal with crime... But how do the deputies themselves assess their work? How far did the session justify the expectations of the voters?

What does our interlocutor today think on this score?

[Alekseyev] I think that the results of the session are what they should be according to the logic of things. I suggest that there could not have been too much and we should not expect it. The Supreme Soviet simply was unable to produce an adequate number of high-class and high-quality laws. There are a number of reasons for this. And the first is to be found in the fact that it is still at the start of the road. The very first steps are being taken. It is the first time that the highest state organ with this composition and with this thrust has been formed. It has neither the experience nor the skill. And, of course, its legislative and lawmaking infrastructure is only just being put together. For it is a question of very important components such as organizing the process of law-making, and providing deputies with information, (which, you will understand, must in the computer age be done on a modern technical level) and appropriate political and legislative standards, and even simply an elementary knowledge of our legislation.

With regard to expectations, this is in general a purely individual matter—one person thinks one thing, another something else. But the main thing is everyone has been convinced that an effective version of a standing organ of power is being formed. The course set by the First Congress of People's Deputies is manifestly being implemented.

[Correspondent] In this connection let me ask this question: How do you assess the lawmaking opportunities of the body of deputies?

[Alekseyev] Very ambiguously. First of all we must take into account the fact that they are all very different people. Here we have very high-class professionals; here I include, for example, F.M. Burlatskiy, V.A. Tikhonov, Ye.P. Velikhov and Ye.M. Primakov—all major scholars and major public figures with many years of seniority in their professional and public activity. They act as real parliamentarians. They are distinguished by a deep insight into the problems and the ability to suggest their own constructive ways to resolve them. And at the same time the composition of the Supreme Soviet includes a certain number of deputies who have obviously "rode in" on the wave of the "struggle against the apparatus" and not only do they not have an adequate skill in legislative work and political standards but also—let me be candid—do not even have a desire for it.

[Correspondent] Are you not being too severe, Sergey Sergeyevich?

[Alekseyev] I do not think that is too severe. Perhaps I am "too" candid... Almost every day voices were heard in the hall, that we are delaying the discussion of issues.

[Correspondent] But is this necessary—to run the machine at top speed? When one sits in the hall, all the time one hears "faster, faster, comrade deputies, decide, adopt, confirm!..." Evidently haste in everything is not the best work method.

[Alekseyev] This is so, but such a large number of questions have accumulated and we got so bogged down at the start of the session discussing the government nominations (often the discussion was not so much of the candidates themselves but rather some kinds of questions "about the candidates") that finally this all affected the further work of the session. Remember that again and again deputies spoke about their own pains and problems and requests: Choose us, comrade minister, here, help in this and then I shall vote for you. Of course, I am a little coarse here, but the nature of some statements was exactly like that.

[Correspondent] You say that the nominations for the posts of minister took too long, but what is wrong with that? The country has still not switched to cost accounting, and a great deal in our economy will, as before, obviously depend on them. Perhaps we should be pleased at the demandingness and meticulous attention to detail shown by our deputies when confirming members of the government. Here we have one equally important and final result—selection of the *creme de la creme*, a precedent in itself. A lesson, if you like. The impression that all of this has made on the country, particularly on that part that we call the apparatus.

[Alekseyev] Yes, to some degree all this is necessary, but here you are obviously not taking into account the fact that all of this has to do not with the legislative function of parliament but with the purely managerial function. In most parliaments in the world a procedure exists under which the government is formed and a cabinet confirmed, but the personnel of this government are not

considered—the parliament places its trust in a prime minister. We do not now have that trust. Most of all, all members of the government were first examined by Supreme Soviet committees and commissions. A procedure, incidentally, that is followed in many parliaments. But with this different: that if the committee there has examined a candidate for a post as a future member of the government and approved him, then the parliament automatically accepts him.

And what do we do? The debate starts all over again. The same questions are asked—tell us this, what about this? What about that?... And about a third or even half of them have already been asked in the commissions, and the candidate has already provided them with a thorough response.

[Correspondent] Nevertheless, Sergey Sergeyevich, your approach is vulnerable: Does this not merely testify to the fact that the organizational, procedural aspect of the session was not “up to scratch”? There would evidently be no “repeat” questions if the deputies had the stenographic record of the discussion of the “nominee” in the commissions and committees. And in general the matter would proceed much more quickly...

[Alekseyev] That is one side of it, but there is another, which I just touched on: the principle of trust. If this custom existed—and in parliamentary practice custom plays a very great role—when the parliament places complete trust in the committees and commissions and when at the parliamentary session the only questions asked are for clarification, and the attention of those present is focused on discussion only of the candidate himself—then things would go much more quickly.

For what in fact happened? They discuss the nominee for the post of minister of machine building, and here, a discussion starts on all the problems we have in machine building—why do we have such and such machine tools rather than others, and what machine tools should we have? And so on for the entire day.... Even though it was necessary to talk about the human qualities of the future minister—his intellectual resources, how he might lead the sector, his relations with people. A minister should be considered broadly, objectively. For it is him they are discussing, not the sector. And I think that here we should place our full trust in a prime minister. If he himself selects these aides, then let us trust him.

[Correspondent] In other words, the “principle of complete trust” should form the foundation of the approach?

[Alekseyev] Yes, precisely. The “premier” would work with this person, but we want to foist another on him: no, that person is not suitable for you, we know better than you... And Nikolay Ivanovich objects: No, he suits me. And we say: You are making a mistake, not this nominee... Well, what kind of a conversation is this?

[Correspondent] Even though the “premier” might make a mistake?

[Alekseyev] Yes, he has the right to make a mistake. But surely this person is his aide, and he has to work with him, not with us.

[Correspondent] Of course, there is reason in all of this, but here is a curious thing: The West European journalists who were constantly present during the ministerial “examinations” were quite unanimous in saying that they were very pleased with this procedure, and that it would be not a bad thing at all to introduce into parliamentary practice in their countries...

[Alekseyev] A typically journalistic approach that harmonizes neither with state-legal thinking nor tradition, because if everyone goes down that path then the parliaments will be very deeply involved in purely managerial activity. But parliament, let me repeat it, should not be involved in this.

Unfortunately, this truth has not got through to us. We still fail to understand who should be doing what. Suddenly voices are heard: But why did the chairman of the Supreme Soviet travel to this country without reporting to us what he was going to do?... Typical ignorance of the principle of division of powers and the division of functions... Yes, power is accountable to the parliament, but within what limits is it independent, autonomous, sovereign? We trust it. Let us proceed from this.

[Correspondent] Based on parliament's first steps, can you give some evaluation of its juridical level?

[Alekseyev] I can. And even must. Even if only because its legislative activity is the most important and determinate aspect of all the work of the Supreme Soviet. Of course, the role of, let us say the juridical element in parliament is very great; what I have in mind is the major jurists who should be among the deputies, and the corresponding legal standards, and the legal preparedness of its members, and the institution of legal aides among the deputies. In general, everything needed for them to evaluate a law at the proper professional level and reach decisions on it.

Here I do not think at all that only the legal experts should be engaged in this. Experience shows that mathematicians, for example, and even simply people from production, may possess a sufficiently refined degree of juridical thinking. But the main thing is that they should have a sense of this legal material, and of course, be acquainted with it. One plus, and a big one, is that for the first time the Supreme Soviet includes major jurists—corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences D.A. Kerimov and G.Kh. Shakhnazarov, and A.M. Yakovlev from the Institute of the State and Law, and also well-known jurists associated with economic law, such as A.A. Sobchak and Yu.Kh. Kalmykov, both doctors of science and both faculty heads. Docent of the Moscow State University K.D. Lubchenko, and Yu.V. Golik, N.V. Fedorov and others are actively involved in the work of parliament.

It is very important that they all be in our parliament. And I think that slowly the jurists begin to gain authority here. People listen to them and go to them for advice and assistance. Everyone has already realized that a law is not at all something that requires sitting behind a desk for a night and then signing everything. Appropriate preparation is essential... I say that the legal element should have a larger representation in the Supreme Soviet, and it seems to me that this was another of the problems that became obvious during the first session.

[Correspondent] Can it be said that in its work the legal strategy formulated at the Congress was displayed to some extent? Or is there still a long way to go to a strategy, and all the lawmaking is reduced to immediate requirements?

[Alekseyev] No, why?! We have already started to work on some of the list of urgent legislative measures outlined by the Congress. We have started work on our economic legislation. Things have also moved ahead here; as you know, the Supreme Soviet has outlined, and the USSR Council of Ministers has already started work on a law on ownership and on leasing relations, and laws on the tax system and land use are being examined. Amendments have already been made to the Law on the State Enterprise and to the ukase on taxes and the cooperatives.

That is, the line that we outlined—to resolve the key problems in our life—is being followed. But I think that it is necessary to go further, necessary to see the prospects for legislation, and prepare now for the future. And if we proceed from this, then top priority must be given to drawing up a new Constitution.

I did say that this would take a year, perhaps 18 months, but I feel now that this was wrong; it is not long enough. At least 2 years are needed. Moreover, when working on this priority legislative enactment we must not act in haste, and simultaneously we must delay or drag out its creation because it is precisely here that we must work out the cardinal questions that will become the point of departure for other documents. Only after that shall we be able to start on deeper work on the main, fundamental directions of legislation.

[Correspondent] Which are?

[Alekseyev] Now we are overloaded with the acute issues of today, the "current" issues—a law on collective labor disputes (otherwise, on strikes), a law on the status of judges. The status of deputies. The regulation of all the hot subjects, as they say. Meanwhile, knowledge of the law itself is made up not of individual building blocks but large blocks that rest on the monolithic foundation of the Constitution. One of these blocks is administrative legislation. Another is civic legislation, a third, labor legislation, and so forth. And when we have resolved all the hot issues, we must in a planned manner, soundly, step by step, start to deal precisely with the work to erect the entire edifice of the law. And then, believe it, all these clamoring problems will be solved much more easily. For

all of this is second-order laws that are based on the large "blocks" themselves, on which we still have to work.

[Correspondent] Do you think that the Supreme Soviet is prepared to work in such strategic legal directions?

[Alekseyev] It is not yet fully prepared. But I think that by the time we switch to "fundamental" legislation our parliament will possess to an adequate degree the necessary legal standards and legal skills.

[Correspondent] It is common knowledge that the the center of gravity in legislative activity is now moving to the Supreme Soviet itself, into the committees and commissions of the chambers. How will this work be organized today? To what extent will the "apparatus" be involved in it?

[Alekseyev] Let me first express my own approach to this category of people employed in our state and production spheres. Here I think that we must be cautious in our assessments. Because it is the thing to complain about and run down all these people across the board. But the "apparatus" is a diverse phenomenon that, of course, does have its other own dark sides, but nevertheless we could in no way manage without it, not least because as a rule the most qualified personnel are concentrated in it. Well, say, how, when preparing a law, could we get by without the apparatus of the Ministry of Justice, which is well known for its own highly qualified lawyers? This means that we must make extensive use of this developed "mechanism" but on the mandatory condition that the center of the entire business must, of course, be the highest representative organ of power—the Supreme Soviet.

[Correspondent] Was there any episode during the session that seemed to you as a jurist particularly significant, out of the ordinary?

[Alekseyev] Yes there was, and it occurred on 31 July. I would say that for us, the jurists, it was a truly historic day although no one would have guessed it. On 31 July the session examined article 7 of the law on state crime. The article caused numerous disputes. Our committee was assigned the task during the recess of preparing our own version together with the participation of other deputies, to be submitted to the deputies for comment and amendment...

We started our work at exactly 3 pm, and at 3:55, that is, 5 minutes before the start of the even session, we completed it. And I presented our version to the Supreme Soviet. The parliament agreed with us. The article was adopted... Meanwhile, it is an extremely important article, extremely acute, and it reflects one of the fundamental problems of criminal legislation, for it dealt with the question of calls for the overthrow of our system by force.

Of course, we are using as a base the version that was submitted to the Supreme Soviet for consideration, but there was no precedent in present legal practice for so

swift an adoption of a law in its entirety, without any kind of agreement at the various "appellate levels." We regard this as a good sign.

[Correspondent] You said that this work was done by the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Legislation, Legality and Law and Order that you head. Such committees and commissions are a new form of work for the Supreme Soviet. What can you say about this, and how it turned out?

[Alekseyev] Positively. There are 40 people in our committee. They included professional jurists, some of whom I have mentioned, but there are also people who are far removed from jurisprudence. And here is the interesting thing: when the conversation turns to the professional level, we all—and we include people with widely differing perceptions—easily find a common language. The professional spiritual, the professional base makes it possible to remove all emotional extremes.

But in general I think that emotion in our business should be reduced to zero. Of course, everything should remain within the bounds of what is sensible, and I favor deputies' statements being emotionally colored, but when resolving the problems that life raises for us, a deputy should be guided only by reason, only by strict logic.

[Correspondent] How do you explain the high percentage of legislative proposals passed back from the Supreme Soviet for further work? Are they prepared too hastily? Or is there some other reason?

[Alekseyev] This is all in the nature of things, usual practice. Plus, there is one other explanation: Many of these documents were prepared in the past, and today they simply do not meet the needs of the times.

[Correspondent] Was there anything at the session that was instructive for you, the director of the Institute of State and Law and a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences

[Alekseyev] Of course there was. Here, in public, we jurists had to defend positions of principles, repeatedly. I paid attention to the fact that the Supreme Soviet always showed understanding with respect to our statements. I think that the Supreme Soviet is a fine school for the jurist. A school where our sometimes abstract constructs encounter real life and other opinions and approaches. There is the clash of differing interests, but ultimately we reach some kind of compromise result that suits everyone.

[Correspondent] I would like to return to a subject on which I have already touched and which unexpectedly became almost the main thing in assessing the activity of the Supreme Soviet. The question of its productivity. Everyone somehow expected that it would promulgate as many laws and decrees and ukases as possible and it would from this aspect of its activity that judgments

would be made about how efficiently our highest legislative body is working. Perhaps there was an idea to consider not only the number of laws adopted but also the number of laws rejected? To make the assessment for the care and meticulousness shown during their examination and discussion?

[Alekseyev] I totally agree with you. And the only thing I would add would be that here at the session experience is being accumulated and a self-learning process is going on in the Supreme Soviet. This is not a rapid process. We should not expect that the second session will make some kind of leap in this respect. But the process has started. And that is the main thing. We evidently need two or three years for the Supreme Soviet to reach the kind of qualitative level that we expect of it.

[Correspondent] Sergey Sergeyevich, what laws can we expect in the near future?

[Alekseyev] I think that the main laws will be submitted for discussion by the deputies sometime in the autumn. These will be laws on ownership, taxes, leasing and leasing relations, and a whole package of laws on human rights—the press, freedom of conscience. They are all now being worked on...

[Correspondent] In your committee?

[Alekseyev] Yes, including in the committee. We have already familiarized ourselves with them and are now engaged in their preparation. We also have to adopt laws on court reform, including the judicial system and criminal law. One such law—the law on the status of judges—was adopted on the last day of the session's work... In general, we are guaranteed work for a long time.

Draft Latvian CP Action Program

18001477 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
27 Jul 89 p 2

["Draft Latvian CP Action Program"]

[Text] Preparations for the Latvian CP Central Committee plenum are proceeding actively in the republic. Very important questions pertaining to perestroika and its activity are being considered at party meetings, aktiv meetings, and plenums, a questionnaire survey is in progress, and many Communists are expressing their opinions in letters to the Central Committee and the editorial offices of the mass media. Workers at a number of raykoms and gorkoms collectively, in contact with the aktiv, have developed a draft of the Latvian CP action program. That work was headed raykom and gorkom first secretaries Ya. Blazhevich (Ventspils), A. Brigmanis (Salda), M. Goba (Dobele), G. Demiters (Kuldiga), T. Evaygnon (Yelgava), I. Kalnin'sh (Tukums), A. Kaulin'sh (Bauska), I. Krastin'sh (Yelgava), P. Ludbarzhs (Stuchka), Kh. Plauks (Liyepaya), V. Sarkans (Talsi), E. Slyshans (Liyepaya), and K. Strazdin'sh (Ogre).

We are publishing the program draft at this time. It must be noted that the first version was published in LAUKU AVIZE newspaper. This version includes amendments and corrections.

The party thoroughly understands the fundamentally new situation in our country and republic and has demonstrated its striving and resolve to implement the course of the socialist restructuring of society that was begun by the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The 19th All-Union Party Conference was of great importance for the further theoretical substantiation and deepening of the course that was set down and for implementing the practical tasks. A considerable impetus in democratizing society and in creating a rule-of-law state was provided by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

The Latvian CP openly admits that the errors that were made in political and practical activity gave rise to unfavorable tendencies in the economy and the social sphere and to distortions in carrying out the Leninist national policy.

The political and economic situation that has developed in the republic requires the Latvian CP, with a sense of high responsibility, to begin preparing for its next congress and to unite all the progressive forces in implementing the ideas of perestroika.

The Latvian CP considers its chief task to be the attainment of the republic's political and economic sovereignty and the independence of the Latvian CP, by developing and bringing forward for discussion by the Communists questions pertaining to the party's status and its Program and Rules.

In this regard, with the purpose of overcoming as rapidly as possible the negative phenomena in the life of society and the party, it is necessary to adopt absolutely fundamental principles for the action of the Latvian CP and its program, which must become the orientation features until the convoking of the next congress.

I. The Party and Latvian History

The Latvian CP admits that for a prolonged period of time the history of Latvia was presented in a form that distorted the facts and deliberately misinterpreted the events of the past.

Today it is necessary, relying on irrefutable factual material, to evaluate scientifically the historical processes in Latvia in the twentieth century, devoting special attention to the following problems:

- the formation of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic and the building of socialism in Latvia (1919-1920);
- the creation of the Latvian republic, and its political and socioeconomic development (1920-1940);

- the interrelationships between the VKP(b) [All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)] and the Latvian CP from 1920 through 1940;

- the history of the LSDRP [Latvian Social-Democratic Workers Party] from 1918;

- the evaluation of the 23 August 1939 Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact and its influence on the political changes on the territory of Latvia;

- the Great Patriotic War on the territory of Latvian SSR, and its political, legal, and demographic consequences;

- the Stalinist repressions against the population of Latvia, and their political, economic, and demographic consequences;

- the perversions of the Leninist national policy in Latvian SSR in 1959 and the social, economic, and demographic consequences of those perversions.

The Latvian CP feels that it is necessary to continue the reviewing of the cases of all the persons who were repressed and sentenced without substantiation and to guarantee the compensation of the psychological damage and the material compensation to the victims of the terror.

It feels that it is necessary to require from the USSR government the recognition of the repressions of Stalinism as being a crime against humanity.

II. The State and the Party

The Latvian CP feels that the guiding role of the Communist Party in society cannot be previously determined, but must be confirmed by practical work. The Latvian CP, as a political organization, does not replace state authority, but implements its own Program by way of the Communists who are working in the soviets.

The Latvian CP considers its chief task to be activity to develop and implement the Concept of the Real Economic and Political Sovereignty of Latvian SSR.

The Latvian CP is in favor of the political and economic sovereignty of Latvian SSR as part of the USSR, on principles of federation, and in favor of concluding a new union treaty and developing the Latvian SSR Constitution with a clear-cut delimitation of the areas of competency of the Union and the republic.

The Latvian CP fights to assure that the laws of Latvian SSR have the highest legal force in the republic, including with respect to USSR laws and to the legal acts of the administrative agencies; it is in favor of a system of legislation, monitoring, and administration in the republic that guarantees the resolution of the chief of guaranteeing the survival of the Latvian nation—self-determination in its own ethnic homeland.

The Latvian CP is in favor of having the decisions that have been developed and made by the republic's

Supreme Soviet conform to the generally recognized international principles and norms of human rights.

The party recognizes that the soviets of people's deputies are the highest authority on the appropriate territory and it fights to reinforce the real independence of the soviets of people's deputies and is in favor of having them bear completely the responsibility for the decisions made by them and for their economic and political consequences. On the basis of the reinforcement of the economic and financial base of the soviets, it is necessary to achieve the completeness of their responsibility in all matters pertaining to the administration of the national economy, the development of the social and production infrastructure, the defense of the environment and the satisfying of people's everyday needs. It is necessary to achieve the supremacy of the elected Soviet agencies with respect to the executive agencies and their apparatus.

The Latvian CP engages actively in developing the Law Governing Elections, the LaSSR Constitution, the Law Governing Self-Government, the Law Governing Citizenship, and other laws.

The Latvian CP, the party's rayon committees, and the primary organizations, in preparation for the forthcoming election of the republic's people's deputies, are developing and implementing their own election platforms (programs) or single ones, jointly with other public organizations.

III. The Party and Public Organizations

On principles of the difference of views, democracy, and political partnership, the party cooperates with those public organizations that express the interests of the nations living in Latvia. By listening to various points of view, the party, in creative and constructive discussions and in polemics with public organizations, fights to carry out its approaches and seeks those decisions that can serve to benefit society as a whole.

By political methods the party defends the strategic trends that it has developed to direct the development of society and also defends its tactics of actions.

The party is ready to take part in a discussion concerning the possibility of creating a multiparty system.

The Latvian CP considers it necessary to develop a Law governing the procedure for registering social-political and public organizations at the Ministry of Law, and in moot instances, at the republic's Supreme Court.

The Latvian CP cooperates with the trade unions, defending the workers' interests.

IV. Economic Policy of the Latvian CP

The Communist Party is in favor of:

—the constitutional reinforcement of the republic's rights to own the land, its mineral resources, internal waters, continental shelf, forests, air space, and all the

property that was created at the expense of state funds and that is situated on the territory of Latvian SSR;

—the complete legal equality of all forms of ownership, their variety, and democratization, and, by political and economic methods, promotes the formation of various forms of ownership and their development on the basis of competition;

—the formation of the budgets of villages, cities, rayons, and the republic "from bottom to top";

—a situation in which, in the economic relations with union republics and foreign countries, the exchange of commodities is carried out at mutually advantageous prices on a contractual basis, with the conducting of a flexible market policy and the defending of the interests of the republic's population;

—is against a unilateral economic policy, the excessively forced development of the production of producer goods, the use of primitive technological schemes, and the increase in extensive production with brought-in manpower;

—and is in favor of the introduction of waste-free production entities and technological schemes.

The party, together with other public organizations, participates in developing the program for improving the economy and the general concept of the development of productive forces, including the formation of free economic zones.

The Latvian CP promotes:

—the formation of a single bank system in sovereign LaSSR, and the establishment of financial relations. A condition for the republic's economic sovereignty is the convertible republic monetary unit (currency);

—the extension of foreign economic ties; the creation of joint enterprises; and the establishment of a well-organized system for personnel training in foreign countries and personnel exchange;

—the reorientation of part of the industrial capacities toward the creation of the infrastructure; the production of consumer goods and equipment for mechanizing agricultural production;

—those trends in scientific research that guarantee the restructuring of social relations and qualitative changes in technology and technological schemes.

The Latvian CP is in favor of:

—a situation in which, in conformity with international practice, currency deductions are established for through-shipment transportation and the use of sea-ports;

—the regulation of state production orders by means of flexible economic methods in industry and agriculture;

—a situation in which the comprehensive development of a territory, including the construction policy, is determined by the soviet of people's deputies in the corresponding territory.

The Latvian CP feels:

- that the republic's government must immediately prepare and publicly announce a balance sheet for inter-republic and international exchange of commodities and services;
- that it is necessary to have a substantial reduction in every kind of administrative apparatus, guaranteeing the clear-cut division of the functions of state and economic administration;
- that the enterprise or the organization itself determines which functions they will transfer for execution to associations or other organizations.

The Latvian CP proposes reviewing and, if necessary, canceling all normative acts and instructional guides with a consideration of the establishment of the republic's economic independence.

In order to guarantee the real development of agriculture, the Latvian CP is in favor of:

- the consistent carrying out of the priority of agriculture. For each fiscal year the LaSSR Supreme Soviet determines the necessary funds and the capacities for using them;
- the democratization of the management system and the profound restructuring of production relations, with which collective farms, state farms, hired collectives, cooperatives, and individual peasant farms can exist simultaneously;
- the efficient, effective use of the land;
- the creation of a balanced system of prices between industry and agriculture;
- the guaranteeing of the necessary material-technical base, with the involvement in its creation of some of the funds and capacities of the industrial enterprises in cities of republic subordination that have been stipulated for the construction and expansion of those enterprises;
- the democratization of the system of administering that branch; the reduction and transformation of the apparatus with a consideration of the recommendations made by the lower-level organizations;
- the guaranteeing of the development of the rural social infrastructure with funds from the republic budget;
- the fundamental review and change of the current construction and social policy in rural areas;
- a situation in which, starting in 1990, peasant farms and individuals building their own homes in rural

areas are provided with building materials, while temporarily limiting the allocation of them to city dwellers for the building of dachas.

V. The Party's Ecological Policy

The Latvian CP feels:

- that the most critical ecological situation has been created in Ventspils, Olayne, Yurmala, and Riga, and Latvia's rivers and the Riga marine bay also need protection. The measures that have been carried out so far are not improving the situation throughout the republic. This has led to a worsening of the population's health and genetic fund and the reduction of the life expectancy;
- that the improvement of the environment and the constant priority of environmental protect are the determining factors for guaranteeing the nation's physical and psychological health and are measures of responsibility toward the current and future generations;
- that the republic's ecological problems can be resolved only by making a radical change in the system of economic relations, by introducing modern environmental-protection and resource-saving technological schemes, and by introducing personal material responsibility for any damage caused to the environment;
- that it is inadmissible to extend any activity of man or any economic activity on any territory without an ecological impact study. Violations of this principle should be considered a crime;
- that it is necessary in the republic to make an inventory of all the ecologically dangerous enterprises and structures and to carry out fundamental measures aimed at eliminating their harmful effect;
- that it is necessary immediately to prepare an ecological-contamination data bank and to introduce a system of permanent monitoring of the state of the environment throughout the republic;
- that the Council of Ministers and the local agencies of executive power must stop allocating to departments sectors for development in Yurmala or in other places that require the protection of the ecology and landscape;
- that it is necessary to create a single ecological-education system.

VI. The Party and Social Policy

The party feels that one of the chief tasks today is the guaranteeing, jointly with other public and political organizations and movements, of the interests and primary needs of people, with a consideration of the causes of social dissatisfaction that have been ascertained by broad research, and the elimination of their consequences.

The party persistently and purposefully promotes:

- the development and implementation of measures to guarantee the satisfying of people's everyday needs of food, consumer goods, and services in an improved variety and with improved quality;
- the consistent implementation of the principles of social justice in the distribution of social and material blessings;
- the adoption of a Law governing the regular increase in wages, pensions, scholarships, and grants to lower-income segments of the population, to bring them up to subsistence level, with the use of state subsidies and in conformity with the degree of price increases and rates of inflation, and to inform the public regularly about these processes;
- the gradual increase in annual leave to 24 days;
- the reinforcement of the family, striving for a situation in which every enterprise, organization, and institution helps young mothers, by increasing the period of their paid maternity leave to three years with a monthly wage adjustment of 50-100 rubles for each child and with the preservation of continuous work longevity;
- the sharp increase in state investments in public-health protection, culture, and science, with the decentralization of the system of administering those branches;
- the creation of an effective system of civil, administrative, and criminal legislation and the carrying out of other measures to fight crime;
- the carrying out of measures that promote the reinforcement of Latvian culture and traditions and their complete development, while supporting the development of the cultures of all the other nations inhabiting Latvia.

VII. The Party and the National Question

The party, struggling to renew the national policy and to implement successively the Leninist principles of national policy, relies on the ideas of V. I. Lenin: "We want a **voluntary** union of nations—a union that will not allow any violence by one nation against another, a union that will be based on the most complete trust, on the clear awareness of fraternal unity, on completely voluntary consent" (V. I. Lenin, PSS [Complete Collected Works], Vol 40, p 43).

The Latvian CP considers to be unacceptable the national policy that was previously carried out, a policy that was based on the idea that the social progress of society is inevitably linked with the disappearance of national differences. It is necessary to evaluate honestly and in a well-principled manner the distortions in national policy and their consequences during the postwar years. It is necessary to extirpate the Stalinist

ideas of autonomization in the theory and practice of legislation and administration.

The Latvian CP proceeds from the premise that Latvia is the only territory in the world where one can assure the development of the Latvian nation, its culture, and its language, the capability of that nation to resolve the vitally important questions in the economic and social spheres, and the nation's right to self-determination, while simultaneously recognizing that all the other nations residing on the territory of Latvia also have the right to develop their own culture and language and have the right, together with the Latvian nation, to engage in the administration of the republic and in economic activity.

The Latvian CP recommends that the republic's Supreme Soviet consider the question of the symbols pertaining to LaSSR.

The party feels that the national question should not be resolved by means of a referendum.

VIII. The Party and Youth

The Latvian CP, by its actions, promotes the development of the creative participation of youth, the growth of its independence, and the formation of political culture.

The Latvian CP feels that there must be a political union of youth that supports the fundamental principles of party activity.

The Latvian CP cooperates with all the democratic youth organizations in Latvian SSR in the attainment of progressive goals.

The Latvian CP makes the demand concerning actual equal rights for all young people in satisfying their spiritual interests, in obtaining the education that they desire, and in guaranteeing them a professional career irrespective of their parents' social status.

The Latvian CP is in favor of humanizing the educational process in the schools and in institutions of higher learning, with the simultaneous specializing of the educational institutions in accordance with the republic's needs and it supports the self-government of school children and students in higher educational institutions.

The party feels:

- that it is necessary to have public discussion about the creation of a professional army;
- that the international education of youth must be carried out only in inseparable link with patriotic education, with the formation of true respect and love for one's republic, hometown or village, educational institution, or labor collective. There is a need to discuss the kind of internationalism that ignores national self-awareness and national feelings;

—that spirituality, the bringing of youth closer to the true values of world and national culture, is a very important task in the educational process.

The Latvian CP is in favor of creating youth cultural centers in all the republic's cities, and the formation of branches of them in the rural inhabited places.

The Latvian CP feels that it is important to be aware of the role played by physical culture and sports in the physical hardening and strengthening of the health of young people, and to carry out organizational and propaganda measures aimed at forming the well-rounded individual.

The Latvian CP is in favor of creating a Latvian National Olympic Committee.

IX. Ideological Activity of the Latvian CP

The ideological platform of the Latvian CP must be improved in conformity with the new conditions, relying upon the materialistic philosophy of the world.

The absolutely fundamental principles of the new political thinking require a factor that must become one of the chief trends in ideological activity in the present situation is the recognition of universal human norms of morality, which must occupy the place of norms of class morality.

The Latvian CP feels:

—that it is necessary to renounce the creation of the image of the enemy in propaganda and to promote the rapprochement and cooperation among all people and all nations;

—that, with the aid of deepening the pluralism, it is necessary to give support to the independent mass media of all public and public-political organizations, and that their activity must be regulated by a Law governing the mass media;

—that it is necessary to convert the House of Political Education into a public-political center of the Latvian CP.

The Latvian CP recognizes the activity of those religious confessions and communities that promote the education of people in the spirit of humanism.

The Latvian CP promotes regular contacts between rayon party committees and primary organizations, on the one hand, and progressive parties and public movements in the socialist and capitalist countries, on the other.

The Latvian CP feels that instruction in a new specialty—political expert—must be introduced at Latvian State University.

The Latvian CP supports:

—the proposal concerning the convoking of a Forum of the Nations of Latvia, and to plan the convoking of a second forum in 1990;

—the convoking of a worldwide forum of Latvians.

The Latvian CP feels that the following editions of the party press are necessary:

—a magazine on political theory and a newspaper of the Latvian CP Central Committee, in Latvian and Russian;

—a political magazine-type weekly publication of the Latvian CP Central Committee, in Latvian and Russian;

—city and rayon newspapers with a precise definition of their status.

The Latvian CP proposes:

—the publication of a special weekly newspaper of the LaSSR Council of Ministers;

—the publication of the KURZEME, LATGALE, VIDZEME, and ZEMGALE regional newspapers.

The Latvian CP feels that, when speaking out in favor of the adoption of the law entitled "Glasnost and the Press," it is necessary to differentiate sharply the relations of the center and the republic in the area of mass media, stipulating independence both in the formation of publishing houses and editorial offices, and in matters of finance and personnel.

X. Improvement and Democratization of the Party's Activity

The Latvian CP, in its activity, stipulates that:

—in intraparty life it is necessary to develop and expand the principles of glasnost and democratization. For that purpose it is necessary to prepare proposals for the 28th CPSU Congress with regard to changes in the Rules, stipulating the increase in the degree of openness of party life; the reduction of the volume of membership dues; changes in the formation and use of the party budget and in determining the personnel structure, and in organizing meetings; the simplification of the procedure for accepting candidate members of the CPSU, as well as their opportunity to leave the party freely;

—it is necessary to create a working group to develop by the new congress of the Latvian CP a Program and Rules for the Latvian Party that will take into consideration the specific nature of the national republic;

—the CPSU Rules must have a section entitled "CPSU and the Communist Parties of the Union Republics," which must be developed while being guided by the absolutely fundamental principles of a union treaty;

- the republic's party organization must have representation in the highest agencies of the CPSU, including the Politburo;
- the criterion that must be considered the chief criterion when forming the party ranks is the person's party and political position, his political competency and participation rate;
- it is necessary to introduce changes into the personnel nomenklatura of the party committees, leaving in it only party workers;
- in the selection and recommendation of personnel for leading work, it is necessary to make it a practice to use scientific methods of studying people's on-the-job and psychological qualities;
- in the primary party organizations it is necessary to reinforce the free, creative exchange of opinions, and to carry out discussions on important questions of party, public-political, and economic life;
- at any level, the party apparatus is subordinate to the elected party agency and bears responsibility to it; the most important decisions are made in accordance with the "from bottom to top" principle.

XI. The Latvian CP and Foreign Policy

The Latvian CP in its activity stipulates:

- the promotion of permanent political, economic, scientific, cultural, and sport links with foreign countries,

as well as the establishment of ambassadorial representations of the Latvian SSR in the United States, Canada, Sweden, West Germany, and Australia;

- contacts with organizations in the workers movement of foreign countries in the Baltic region and in other countries.

LaSSR CP Membership Detailed

18001231 Riga KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII
in Russian No 6, Jun 89 pp 28-35

[Report by Organizational Party and Cadre Work Department of the Latvian CP Central Committee: "The Communist Party of Latvia in Figures"]

[Text] All data given in the tables are as of 1 January of the corresponding year.

Table 1. Composition of the Communist Party of Latvia and the Growth of Its Ranks

Year	CPSU Members	CPSU Candidate Members	Total Communists
1987	175,249	5,524	180,773
1988	178,458	5,396	183,854
1989	180,154	4,028	184,182

Table 2. Composition of the Communist Party of Latvia by Social Status of Communists

Year	Workers		Peasants (Kolkhoz Farmers)		White Collar	
	in absolute figures	in percent	in absolute figures	in percent	in absolute figures	in percent
1987	76,706	42.4	21,699	12.0	82,368	45.6
1988	78,423	42.6	21,802	11.9	83,629	45.5
1989	78,223	42.5	22,821	12.4	83,138	45.1

Table 3. Composition of Communists Included in White Collar Category, by Occupation (in percent)

Occupation	1987	1988	1989
All communists included in white collar category	100	100	100
Of them:			
—directors of rayon, city, and republic institutions, organizations and their structural subdivisions	5.8	5.7	5.3
—engineering and technical workers and agricultural specialists	41.7	42.3	41.8
—managers of industrial, transportation, communications, and construction enterprises and sovkhozes, and their deputies	8.3	9.7	9.2
—workers in science, education, public health, literature, and art	25.2	25.5	25.8
—workers at enterprises of trade, public catering, supply, and sales	4.2	4.4	4.6

Table 4. Composition of Communists by Education (in percent)

Education	1987	1988	1989
All communists	100	100	100
Including those with:			
—higher education	31.2	31.9	32.7
—incomplete higher education	2.1	2.1	2.0
—secondary education	44.7	45.0	45.0
—incomplete secondary education	16.3	15.7	15.2
—primary education	5.5	5.1	4.8
—no primary education	0.2	0.2	0.2

Table 5. Number of Communists Who Are Specialists in Various Fields of Knowledge with a Higher and Secondary Special Education

Year	In Absolute Figures	In Percentage of Total Number of Communists
1987	102,895	56.9
1988	106,219	57.8
1989	108,056	58.7

Table 6. Number of Communists Having an Academic Degree

Year	Doctor of Sciences	Candidate of Sciences
1987	236	2,207
1988	257	2,273
1989	262	2,397

Table 7. Number of Women in Communist Party of Latvia

Year	In Absolute Figures	In Percentage of Total Number of Communists
1987	69,055	38.2
1988	70,706	38.4
1989	70,957	38.5

Table 8. Ages of Party Members and Candidate Members (as of 1 Jan 1989)

Age	In Absolute Figures	In Percentage of Total Number of Communists
All Communists	184,182	100
Of them:		
25 years and under	4,966	2.07
26-30 years	16,715	9.1
31-40 years	40,568	22.0
41-50 years	39,671	21.5
51-60 years	46,399	25.2
over 60 years	35,863	19.5

Table 9. Nationality Composition of Communist Party of Latvia (as of 1 Jan 1989)

Nationality	In Absolute Figures	In Percent
Total CPSU Members and Candidate Members	184,182	100
Of them:		
—Russians	79,382	43.1
—Latvians	73,177	39.7
—Ukrainians	10,317	5.6
—Belorussians	10,250	5.6
—Others	11,056	6.0
In all—83 nationalities.		

Table 10. Composition of CPSU Members by Length of Party Service (as of 1 Jan 1989)

Length of Service	In Absolute Data	In Percentage of Total Number of CPSU Members
Total CPSU Members	180,154	100
Including those with service of:		
—up to 5 years	23,496	13.0
—5-10 years	24,001	13.3
—10-20 years	44,947	25.0
—20-30 years	51,397	28.5
—30-50 years	35,251	19.6
—50 years or more	1,062	0.6

Table 11. Distribution of Communists by Sectors of the National Economy (in percent)

	1987	1988	1989
Total Communists employed in the national economy	100.0	100.0	100.0
In material production sectors	70.1	69.7	69.7
Including:			
—in industry, construction, transportation, and communications	65.5	65.0	64.7
—in agriculture	26.0	26.6	26.7
of that number:			
-on sovkhozes	34.2	33.5	32.9
-on kolkhozes	60.2	61.1	61.8
—in trade, public catering, procurement, material-technical supply and sales	8.5	8.4	8.6
In nonproduction sectors	29.9	30.3	30.3
Including			
—in science, education, public health, and culture	53.7	53.8	54.9
—in bodies of state and economic administration, in the staff of party and social organizations	31.2	30.2	29.2
—in housing, public, and consumer services	10.8	11.2	11.0
—remaining sectors	4.3	4.8	4.9

Table 12. Structure of Local Party Bodies and Primary Party Organizations

	1987	1988	1989
Gorkoms	7	7	7
City Raykoms	6/1	6/1	6/1
Rural Raykoms	26	26	24
Total primary party organizations	3,888	3,924	3,954
Including:			
—those having party committees	326	331	310
of those, with rights of party raykom	5	5	7
Total shop party organizations	3,535	3,606	3,525
—those with rights of primary party organizations	2,407	2,456	2,517
Total party groups	5,820	5,619	4,917

Note: Number in denominator shows party committee of Latvian Steamship Line.

Table 13. Admission into the CPSU

Year	Admitted as Party Members	Admitted as Candidate Members
1986	4,998	5,071
1987	4,719	4,697
1988	2,807	3,864

Table 14. Composition of CPSU Candidate Members Admitted, by Occupation (in percent)

Occupation	1986	1987	1988
Total candidate members admitted	100.0	100.0	100.0
Of them:			
—workers	59.0	57.7	41.5
—kolkhoz farmers	10.6	10.9	9.0
—engineering and technical workers, agronomists, zootechnicians, scientific workers, teachers, physicians, and other specialists	24.2	24.8	41.0
—administrative and management staff workers	5.3	5.6	6.7
—students	0.9	1.0	1.8

Table 15. Admission of Workers as Party Candidate Members (as of 1 Jan 1989)

	Percentage
Total workers admitted as party candidate members	100.0
Of this number, those working at:	
—industrial enterprises	39.5
—transportation enterprises	14.2
—communications enterprises	1.3
—construction enterprises	11.1
—sovkhozes	14.7

Table 16. Admission of Kolkhoz Farmers as Party Candidate Members (as of 1 Jan 1989)

	Percent
Total kolkhoz farmers admitted as party candidate members	100.0
Of this number:	
—tractor operators, combine operators, drivers, and other machinery operators	24.9
—those working in livestock raising	16.2
—those working in crop growing, sheep raising, and gardening	6.3
—agronomists, zootechnicians, engineers, and other agricultural specialists	25.3

Table 17. Composition of CPSU Candidate Members Admitted (as of 1 Jan 1989)

	Percent
Total party candidate member admitted	100.0
Of them:	
—women	42.1
—Latvians	43.5
—Komsomol members	50.4

Composition of Party Cadres

In accordance with the decisions of the July 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the October 1988 Plenum of the Communist Party of Latvia, the apparatus of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and of party gorkoms and raykoms has been reorganized in the republic.

As a result of the new organizational structure, the number of senior officials in the apparatus of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee has been cut by 29.4 percent. The Ventspils and Rezekne rayon party committees have been abolished.

Table 18. Number of Senior Officials in the Apparatus of the Latvian Communist Party, Gorkoms, and Raykoms

	As of 1 Jan 88	As of 1 Jan 89	1989 in percentage of 1988
Total	1,129	1,026	90.9
Including:			
apparatus of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee	170	120	70.6
party gorkoms	195	189	96.9
party raykoms	145	143	98.6
in city of Riga			
rural party raykoms	619	574	92.7

The reorganization of the party apparatus of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and the freeing of part of its workers made it possible to use them to strengthen important sectors of state, economic, and social activities. Of the total number of workers released, 10 were sent to other sectors of party work, 11 to soviet work, 20 to economic work, and 13 were retired.

Today, 99.1 percent of the senior officials of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee apparatus have a higher education; 61.1 percent are specialists of industry or agriculture; 48.1 percent have a higher party-political education; and 16.7 percent are studying at party educational institutions. Nine are candidates of science.

Of the total number of senior officials employed in party gorkoms and raykoms, 759 or 95.8 percent have a higher

education, and 434 or 54.8 percent are specialists in the national economy. Of the 156 agricultural specialists, 139 or 89.1 percent are senior officials of rural party raykoms. One out of every three party apparatus worker has a party-political education.

Table 19. Number of Individual Official Groups of Senior Officials of Party Gorkoms and Raykom Having a Party-Political Education (as of 1 Feb 1989)

	In absolute figures	In percentage of the total number of workers in the corresponding official group
All party committee workers	265	33.5
Of them:		
—secretaries	56	50.9
—department heads	22	28.2
—party commission chairmen	26	72.2
—section heads	37	53.6
—instructors	109	24.1

As of 1 February 1989, 7.2 percent of the senior officials of party gorkoms and raykoms were studying in higher party educational institutions.

Women comprise 53.7 percent in party committees.

Table 20. Number of Women Working in Party Committees of the Republic (as of 1 Feb 1989)

	In absolute figures	In percent
Party gorkoms	80	45.9
Party raykoms in Riga	58	46.0
Rural party raykoms	287	58.3

Half of the department heads and instructors in city and rayon party committees are women. Last year, the number of women elected secretaries of party gorkoms and raykoms decreased from 34.2 percent to 26.4 percent.

In the general course of democratization of the life of the Soviet society, steps are being taken to improve the mechanism of electivity of governing bodies in the party. The practice of electing party gorkom and raykom secretaries from two or more candidates is becoming increasingly widespread. In 1988, 23 party committee secretaries were elected in this manner, compared to 7 in 1987.

After the reports and elections campaign in 1985, the number of specialists of industrial and agricultural production among the secretaries of party gorkoms and raykoms decreased from 66.1 percent to 53.6 percent.

Table 21. Composition of Party Gorkom and Raykom Secretaries by Nationality (in percent)

Year	Latvians	Russians	Other Nationalities
1986	53.4	35.6	11.0
1987	53.4	35.6	11.0
1988	52.9	31.6	15.5
1989	66.4	20.0	13.6

During the last reports and elections campaign, the secretaries of party committees were somewhat rejuvenated.

Table 22. Age Composition of Party Gorkom and Raykom Secretaries (in percent)

Age	As of 1 Jan 1986	As of 1 Feb 1989
30 years and under	-	-
31-40 years	37.3	42.7
41-50 years	52.5	50.0
51-60 years	10.2	7.3
over 60 years	-	-

In the last 5 years, the number of secretaries of party committees and party bureaus of primary organizations discharged increased by 17.2 percent.

Table 23. Distribution of Positions of Discharged Secretaries of Party Committees and Party Bureaus of Primary Organizations by Sectors of the National Economy (as of 1 Feb 1989)

	In absolute figures	In percent
Total	558	
Of them:		
—in industry, construction, transportation, and communications	147	26.3
—at kolkhozes	150	26.9
—at sovkhoses	198	35.5
—in science	13	2.3
—in higher and secondary special educational institutions	6	1.1
—in other organizations	44	7.9

The largest number (84.5 percent) of discharged secretaries of primary party organizations having a higher education are working in party organizations of industry.

In party organizations of kolkhozes 48 or 33.3 percent and of sovkhoses 89 or 45.6 percent of the discharged secretaries are specialists of agriculture.

Only 116 of the discharged party organization secretaries (21.2 percent) have a party-political education; 12 of them are employed in industry, 22 at kolkhozes, and 55

at sovkhoses. Of the total number of secretaries, 341 or 62.3 percent are Latvians, and 22.6 percent are women.

The age composition of secretaries of primary party organizations is fairly high.

Table 24. Composition of Discharged Secretaries of Party Committees and Party Bureaus of Primary Party Organizations by Age (as of 1 Feb 1989)

	In absolute figures	In percent of total number
Total secretaries	547	
Ages:		
30 years and under	36	6.6
31-40 years	210	38.4
41-50 years	171	31.3
51-60 years	125	22.8
over 60 years	5	0.9

COPYRIGHT: IZDATELSTVO TsK KP LATVII.
"KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII" 1989.

LiSSR CP First Secretary Plenum Speech

18001390 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
25 Jun 89 pp 1,3

[Speech by Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee at the 18th Plenum of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee held 24 June 1989: "On the Political Activity of the Lithuanian CP at the Present Stage"]

[Text] Today, four months after the Lithuanian CP Central Committee's previous, 17th Plenum, we have gathered in this hall again. The documents that were adopted then, in February, met with a mixed response by the republic's party organizations and public. No one disputed the main goal set forth in the plenum's report—to consolidate all of society's progressive forces that support restructuring. And today one can repeat that in order to create a democratic, humanistic, socialist Lithuania based on the rule of law it is necessary to continue to be guided by the communists' motto: "Lithuania without sovereignty is Lithuania without a future." At the same time, it must be recognized that some speeches made at the plenum and part of its resolution were received with a certain hostility. A number of points in the resolution have not been carried out. Such a dynamic course of life has brought new circumstances that change the conditions of the party organization's activity. On the other hand—and I dare say this is the main thing for us—the plenum revealed the inability of some Central Committee members to realistically evaluate the political situation and correctly forecast it.

Over the past four months our society has taken on new features. The Lithuanian CP has already been working for some time now under the conditions of political pluralism. For many of us this is unfamiliar, and some

people are attempting to ignore this situation. But the political calendar has been varied. Elections of USSR People's Deputies and their Congress have taken place, as has a session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet at which historic decisions for Lithuania were adopted. Almost weekly reconstituent, constituent or special congresses have been held at which existing creative unions, trade and other associations have declared their separateness from all-union structures. This path has been taken by the Komsomol, as well.

The processes taking place in the republic's societal life could not fail to have affected the Lithuanian CP, as well. That is natural. The present plenum and its topics have been dictated by life itself. We must discuss the path that has been covered and the prospects for future activity, and must outline steps that will be able to express the aspirations of Lithuania's population. We are obligated to recognize: the restructuring that was begun by the party is particularly lagging behind in the party itself. This conclusion, at which M. S. Gorbachev arrived at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, accords with the view of many of Lithuania's Communists, as well. We all recall how much we expected of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Unfortunately, the progressive resolutions that were adopted have changed very little. The CPSU Central Committee has not hurried to carry out the resolutions that were adopted. This is causing concern among communists. Dissatisfaction is being expressed in various forms. The number of people who do not want to be in the party has increased. This year 1,500 communists turned in their party documents. The number of new party members has decreased substantially. More and more often the requirements of the CPSU Statutes are being deliberately ignored in party organizations, and in a number of organizations communists are arbitrarily establishing rules for the accumulation of party funds. Ideological spinelessness and organizational instability are intensifying in communists' ranks.

For some time now at meetings and in the mass media the active segment of communists that does not want to reconcile itself to the existing situation has been raising the question of the Lithuanian CP's independence and prestige in society. Some party committees have set up working groups to consider this problem, have been circulating questionnaires, and have been discussing proposals in various forums. A plenum of Vilnius's Leninskiy Raykom came out for the preparation of a Program and Statutes of the Lithuanian CP. Communists in Kaunas's Pozhelskiy Rayon proposed that a discussion be held on these matters. Such proposals have come in from many places in the republic.

In society the opinion persists that the party Central Committee has lagging behind the pace of political processes and reacting sluggishly to communists' concern. This is partly our fault. We take positive decisions, but we do not ensure that they are carried out. On the other hand, we do not know how to demonstrate our deeds in a timely and open fashion.

The renewal of the Lithuanian CP is a fundamental problem of the organization's functioning. The diversity of present-day phenomena, the importance of the problems that have accumulated, and their influence on the party's activities are creating an objective need for further actions on the part of our organization to consult with all of Lithuania's communists. For this purpose we could make use of the party discussion, which has undeservedly been forgotten but was formerly practiced widely. In the course of such a discussion, all aspects of party life and the areas of restructuring at all levels of the organization must be discussed.

At our initiative a group of specialists has already been set up and has presented its proposals, and the Lithuanian CP Central Committee's Commission on Organizational Party and Personnel Work has examined this matter in detail. Scholars specializing in party history took part in a meeting of the three Baltic republics' scholars that was held in May. A working group to generalize proposals concerning the party's status is being set up under the Lithuanian CP Central Committee.

The problem of the party's independence concerns other strata of the population, as well. There is a deepening understanding of the fact that an objective contradiction has arisen—the level of independence of the Lithuanian CP fails to accord with the aspirations of the republic's inhabitants for the establishment of a sovereign state. The study of public opinion shows that the party is not given particularly high marks. Its prestige does not accord with its declared role in society. Only renewal, only an organization of communists that answers to the demands of the times can become a real guarantee of restructuring in the republic.

Today one can sense increasing dissatisfaction with the deteriorating material situation, the polarization of society, and mistrust in leaders of various levels and in the very idea of socialism. Lithuania's independence is perceived as practically a magic wand that will automatically solve all problems. Under this banner, various political forces are coming forth and public opinion is being increasingly manipulated. We need a realistic policy that will not play on people's ideals but will lead to people's desired goal through well-founded actions. Without such a policy it will be hard for the party to destroy the system of bureaucratic centralism that has permeated all spheres of society's life, and to ensure the stability of Lithuania's forward progress. Such an understanding of the party's role in our society has become increasingly obvious lately.

At all times society has attempted to define its ideal and the goals of its development. There have been legends of "islands of happiness," the idea of a "Kingdom of God" on earth, and the utopian image of the City of the Sun. And we talked for a long time about striving for communism. If we are true dialecticians, we should recognize that the development of reality is higher than plans. We already know a good deal about how the idea of

socialism has been distorted and deformed in practical activity. Therefore, in defining the goal of the Lithuanian CP's activity, we must repudiate the faulty habit of drawing vague pictures of the future. Let us call our ideals by words that have been tested by experience and time—humanism, democracy, freedom, social justice, and accord among people, peoples and states. We must not only turn toward the Lithuanian CP but must also seek points of contact with other positive movements and groups.

If we are speaking of a Lithuanian communist, his traits must be linked to the character of the people, to the decency that is characteristic of a Lithuanian, and to the industriousness of a person who is close to the land. We should resist the submissiveness that was instilled in us in the hard past, and on the other hand we should resist the national arrogance with which today's orators intoxicate the crowd in their speeches.

We must understand that in today's conditions social consciousness is acquiring a radically new quality. Revived by restructuring and the national upsurge, it is becoming increasingly politicized and is being expressed through extremely diverse means: in valuable civic actions and in activeness as manifested in public rallies; but alas, it is also being expressed in extreme forms of intransigence and ultimatums. Emotional exultation often dulls common sense and the age-old wisdom of the people.

We must be guided in our activity by the idea of the wholeness of Lithuanian society. The republic's communists and the Sajudis aktiv took part in preparing the draft of the new Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR and of the laws adopted at the latest session of the Supreme Soviet. It demonstrated that restrained but amicable work for the good of society brings immeasurably greater benefit than mutual feuding. We must proceed on this premise in the future, too.

Of course, this does not mean that Lithuanian's communists are no longer determined to hold a principled discussion. We should not avoid heated debates with those people who put forward unwarranted demands and do not want to accept realistic political thinking. Discussions are needed, and not just in order to change someone's mind with arguments. The main thing is, in heated debates, to rid ourselves of outmoded views and work out new ideological positions.

The time has come for difficult decisions and reflections. Sensing our responsibility before our own people and the representatives of other peoples living in Lithuania, we cannot eradicate several decades from history and portray matters as though it were possible to continue the prewar Lithuanian Republic. During this time Lithuania has radically changed, and the international situation is also incomparable.

Yes, the lessons of history are useful for those who want to utilize them in order not to repeat past mistakes. The

Lithuanian CP, analyzing the complex political situation, is devoting more and more attention to the questions of its own history.

Our party operated in a relatively small state toward which its great neighbors were not always amicably disposed. It is appropriate to recall that it had only existed a short while when the workers' and peasants' state was established in the east under the leadership of V. I. Lenin. For decades the Lithuanian CP found itself under the oppression of Stalinism. That radically weakened the party's forces, which were not numerous to start with.

For many years Lithuanian communists, operating in the deep underground and constantly persecuted by local reactionary forces, were forced to be guided by the principle established by the Comintern according to which the attitude toward the Soviet Union was considered the main criterion of internationalism. Under these conditions it was comparatively easy for the Lithuanian Republic's ruling circles to call communists the agents of another state. And that is what they did. In this connection, special stress was placed on a lack of patriotism. That was not true. Many party documents and practical actions attested to the fact that the party was defending the national interests of Lithuania's working people.

The totalitarian system formed by Stalinism affected the Lithuanian CP, too. In the prewar years the names of our party's prominent figures who had been living in the Soviet Union disappeared from the political arena one after another. In 1937-1938 the Comintern leadership tried to elicit mistrust in the Lithuanian CP. The party was operating in difficult circumstances in 1940. In September the Lithuanian CP became only a part of the All-Union CP (Bolsheviks). The procedure for the admission of members of Lithuania's party organization into the All-Union CP (Bolsheviks) amounted to a purge of the party. Efforts were made to prove that there were many provocateurs in the ranks of the Lithuanian CP. In just eight months communists sent into Lithuania came to constitute 73 percent of the new members of the Lithuanian CP. The new arrivals were appointed to important positions in party and soviet bodies. As late as 1973 yet another act of disregard for our communists was committed—now the name of the Lithuanian CP was expunged from party membership cards.

Today many of our opponents are insistently demanding repentance of the party and demanding that the party, and the party alone, assume full responsibility for the past 50 years. Granted, mistakes were made. Difficult and cruel mistakes. But today the Lithuanian CP has only about 500 communists with 50 years of party membership. The vast majority of Lithuania's communists have held membership for 15 years or less. What is there for them to repent of? Finally, are communists alone to blame for the problems and pains of present-day Lithuania?

Let history be the witness.

It is not the communists who are to blame for the fact that Lithuania's heads of government uncomplainingly accepted the ultimatum of the Polish government in the spring of 1938 concerning the restoration of diplomatic relations, thereby consigning the question of Vilnius, to all intents and purposes, to oblivion; or for the fact that a year later they accepted fascist Germany's ultimatum that Klaipeda and Klaipeda Territory be torn away from Lithuania. It is not the communists who are to blame for the fact that, following brief doubts, the 14 June 1940 ultimatum of Stalin's government was accepted. Of course, it is difficult to speak about this, but it is necessary to do so. If only because some people are trying to get by with heaping all the blame for the nation's tragic fate on the communists.

Granted, Lithuania's communists did far from everything to demonstrate their loyalty to their homeland in deeds. But if we do not hear voices today accusing the leaders of the Lithuanian Republic of that time of being unable to defend their former statehood and of losing it, there are likewise no grounds for the unqualified accusation of Lithuania's communists of subsequently being unable to resist the pressure of Stalinism. Let us be objective: under those tragic conditions it was they—Snechkus, Paletskis, Gedvilas, Shumauskas and many others—who did everything they could for the people of Lithuania. They also deserve credit for the fact that today we have relatively good economic indices, a decent situation in agriculture, and a culture that has won world recognition. Therefore, it seems, they should not be called cosmopolitans and have other insulting labels pinned on them. Today it is also impossible to take the path, which was well worn by Stalinism, whereby attempts are made to condemn people and even whole generations of communists without legal proof. We openly declare that today's Lithuanian communists stand in the same ranks with all honest people.

One cannot remake history. It should teach us all. Otherwise its lessons will go in vain. Therefore, today we cannot repeat the mistakes of Lithuania's first communists. They underestimated the importance of statehood and consequently lost many of their followers.

We unequivocally condemn the deals made by the Stalin and Hitler regimes in 1939-1941 and their predatory policy toward neighboring states. But from the standpoint of international law the present status of the Lithuanian SSR, unfortunately, in no way changes that. Even if Moscow and Bonn were to join in the condemnation. The same thing can be said of the evaluation of the 1940 elections to the People's Sejm of Lithuania, and of the fact of its entry into the USSR. In studying the historical facts of that time we also inevitably come to the evaluation of the 1936 Sejm elections, which in no way reflected the people's will, and of the 1926 coup, after which the nationalists seized power by unconstitutional means.

Thinking people realize that the path to the independence or sovereignty of the Lithuanian state lies not

through an evaluation of events of 50 years ago, but through the present-day legal system. Both the Constitution of Lithuania and the USSR Constitution provide the possibility of seceding from the USSR. The doors are not locked. It seems that two means are possible: the first is to cut, in a single blow, the knot of our history that has been tied over the past 50 years; the other is to untangle that knot.

Let us reflect a bit. Does Lithuania have the forces for the first means, the understanding and support of its neighbors, Europe and the world? After all, that would mean a great and destructive blow to democratization and restructuring and to the new political thinking, without which our planet is doomed. We would find ourselves, as it were, in an airless space and would start to totally destroy everything that has been built. We would start to redraw borders, and the questions of Vilnius and Klaipeda would arise anew.

It is considerably more difficult to untangle the knot, giving up illusions and "great leaps" and accepting the reality of today's fragile world as it is. In taking that path, it is impossible to promise that in six months or a year we will be independent of everything. More time and effort will be required along that difficult path. But we can say with certainty that along that path there will be no tragic shocks and conflicts, which our relatively small people cannot permit itself.

Sovereignty begins with the economy. No one reckons with the weak. Until Lithuania's economy can produce sufficient goods for export, and until it wins constant demand on the world market, the danger of falling from one dependency to another will remain.

Our opponents' attempts to seek parallels with the 1918 situation in Lithuania in our arguments are incorrect. Let us recall the fact alone that Lithuania at that time used 400 tons of kerosine a year, whereas it now uses 8.5 million tons of petroleum products. Economic data are laconic but indisputable.

Despite all our internal problems and contradictions, we have no right to be either egocentric or excessively impatient. Many of the world's countries today find themselves in a grave, very grave situation. Former great Germany is divided. The best-guarded wall in the world divides Berlin, where the occupational troops of four countries are stationed, in half. Such is reality. Significant processes are taking place in Eastern Europe, especially in Hungary and Poland. But not a single government allows itself desperate, convulsive attempts or actions capable of destabilizing the situation in an individual country or region, or the world.

Under the conditions of Lithuania's development as a sovereign state, its relations with all countries are important to it. But as a result of our geopolitical situation, our relations with our neighbors in the West and, especially, the East will invariably have special importance. We live with them and will continue to live with them. Lithuania's destiny will not be decided in Lithuania alone. We

should march in step with our neighbors and with the progressive changes in Eastern Europe. Our future lies in our wisdom, will and determination.

In the war and postwar years Lithuanian land flowed abundantly with blood, and the eyes of the exiles were filled to overflowing with horror. The solution of many problems of vital importance to the Lithuanian people and its neighbors was delayed and distorted by the decades of stagnation. All this created a truly favorable soil for the emergence of all sorts of conflicts—social, nationality, etc. Therefore, it is not easy for some people at present to find a common language. But we should do this ourselves without hurrying, carefully thinking each situation through, step by step, for the right to create an independent life will not be granted to us by either East or West, but they also have no right to deprive us of this right.

The Lithuanian CP supports socialism with conviction. At one time an inclination toward strict definitions of it predominated. But this often signified merely desperate attempts to force reality into a certain framework. Such a path holds absolutely no promise. We are required to repudiate it and engage in a concrete analysis of the tendencies that permit society and all of its members to rise to a qualitatively new stage of development. In this sense everything that contributes to social progress is acceptable to us.

The development of society, its economy and culture, and the entire spiritual sphere should satisfy the requirements of each person and bring him up as a free and comprehensively developed personality. Neither the collective, nor the nation, nor the state must be turned into an absolute. The human being is the supreme measure of everything. His labor, creativity and energy are the factor determining all material and spiritual values.

The Lithuanian CP Central Committee sets itself the goal of restoring Lithuania's statehood, which will reflect the will of the Lithuanian people. In a harmonious combination of the sovereignty [suverenitet] of Lithuania and the USSR, we will strive for the real implementation of the sovereignty [polnovlastiye] of the republic soviets of people's deputies at all levels, of economic autonomy, of the supremacy of our Constitution and our legislation, of republic citizenship, and of the right to own land and other natural resources. Our goal is the full self-government of the people at all levels. A "strong center" in Vilnius is also unnecessary. In this case a decisive condition is not only the democratization of elections to the soviets, but the establishment of a system of bodies of a genuinely democratic state. Therefore, we must first of all abandon the duplication of the functions of supreme state authority between the Congress of Lithuanian SSR People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet, as is indicated in the draft Lithuanian SSR Constitution. I think that we must change the system of soviets of people's deputies with a view to the principles of the internal organization of Lithuania's

territory, the interests of the population, and the historical traditions of the development of the region's parliamentary democracy.

The tasks that we must accomplish require the cohesiveness of the republic's people of all nationalities, and the unity of their actions. Unfortunately, today we often encounter unjustifiable criticism directed not just at individuals but at entire peoples, and totally unsupported claims. The resistance of some people to the state status of the Lithuanian language, the proclamation of certain [villages] [apilinki] in Vilniuskiy and Shalchinskiy rayons to be Polish national [villages], and lately, even attempts to establish a Polish autonomous oblast in the Vilnius region are causing alarm in society. Such actions, which are contrary to the Lithuanian SSR Constitution, not only are not solving the genuinely important problems that have accumulated in those regions, but will also build up tension and suspiciousness among people of different nationalities. The position of the republic's leadership on this matter is clear and unequivocal: satisfaction of the interests of all national groups living in Lithuania is possible only on a new legal basis. At present a group of specialists that will draft a law on legal guarantees for national groups has been set up under the Presidium of the republic Supreme Soviet.

When the appeal "All power to the soviets!" is declared, a question arises concerning the role of the Lithuanian CP in the republic's political system. It will have to be resolved in the course of preparing the draft Lithuanian SSR Constitution. We support the idea that well-known Article 6 should accord with reality. The political party should ensure its role in society through deeds, and not through sonorous declarations. The principal point in the problem is the clear-cut legislative delimitation of the functions of party and state authority. But every party develops and strives to implement its own political course in the economic, social and spiritual spheres. It does so with the help of its members working in state agencies. We will attempt to bring about a situation in which the party is rid of itself completely of throwbacks to the administrative-command mechanism, and in which that mechanism is eliminated both within the party and throughout the whole political system. Unfortunately, our party still often engages in activities that are extraneous to it. It is absolutely incomprehensible to us why the Central Committee, the gorkoms and the raykoms should examine thousands of letters regarding the obtaining of apartments, automobiles and garages, and other similar issues. The resolution of such issues presently lies in the sphere of the executive authority. That is our principled premise. I am certain that the party committees should consider only those letters that deal with party officials and internal party matters. And in our activities we should not forget one thing: the party is a political organization, and it should participate in the activities of state agencies using generally accepted means.

In order to more effectively accomplish the tasks facing the party, it is necessary to take a critical attitude toward

the traditional methods and forms of work. The real political situation, which demands appropriate reflection of the processes that are occurring, and the desire to maintain the political initiative in its hands confront the party with the task of making wider use of intellectual potential. Especially since political decision-making today has become a more complex and important matter. Any mistakes in the eyes of the public are exaggerated especially easily and cause people to mistrust the political course.

Therefore, it is necessary to create the conditions within the party itself for the more active manifestation of its members' constructive energy. The party shows insufficient concern for its intellectual potential. This has affected the composition of party personnel and the organization of work. In order to renew the party we should devote priority attention to this problem. We have a shortage of political workers with high and top qualifications, and on ideological and other commissions we need communists who possess the qualities of members of the intelligentsia and think in unconventional ways. We need a well-organized sociological service. The party will do everything possible to support the study of economics, history, political science and ethics. The main problem is to find, train and advance leaders who are prepared for brilliant political deeds, who possess a keen sixth sense, and who think unconventionally.

In the present situation of the rapid democratization of the life of state and society, it is necessary to radically revise and update the party's personnel policy. It should become a genuine policy, and not a command-directive system. The advancement of personnel at all levels should take place in an atmosphere of democracy that ensures the comprehensive discussion of candidates, a choice among candidates, and the selection of people who enjoy indisputable prestige and are able to carry out the policy of restructuring.

Lately there have been many charges and attacks against the apparatus, especially the party apparatus. One cannot claim that they are groundless. But everyone should understand that any political organization cannot get by without an apparatus. We need a new type of party official—we need a professional who has a mastery of present-day information technology, who is subject to control by party members by democratic means, and who is capable of stepping up political, economic and social progress.

And another problem. Under present-day conditions, the questions of social and moral protection are especially relevant for elective officials. Alas, so far no legal mechanism has yet been established in either society or the party, and there are no legislative acts protecting their general civil rights and guaranteeing a party official a certain compensation following his resignation or a change in his sphere of work.

The democratization of the management sphere and of political life, which is accompanied by a pluralism of views, indisputably demands unshakable ideological unity of the party. The importance of ideological, propaganda and upbringing work is increasing as never before. After all, at the present time, when the functions of real authority and management are increasingly being turned over to the Soviets and the economic-management agencies, ideology remains perhaps the sole product created by the party itself.

Party organizations should shape people's opinion and views solely through active methods that are acceptable and persuasive. Today one can predict rather accurately that the most actively discussed issues in the near future will be the issues of the development of nationality relations and the culture of internationality intercourse, the economic autonomy of the republic, relations between the party and society and between church and state, and the questions of Lithuania's history and culture, spiritual rebirth, morality and democracy. We must be prepared for this.

One could say a great deal about the mistakes of our press, television and radio, and could recall one-sided publications or broadcasts; after all, one does encounter them. But I think that it is far more important today to consult on how to make more effective use of the press's vast potential.

We all recognize that, along with the creative unions and scholars, the press was the first to become involved in work to activate restructuring in Lithuania.

Today it faces new tasks. The system of periodical publications must be restructured in order that it better meet society's needs in the present political situation. Certain unpopular publications that operate at a loss must be abandoned, and new ones must be published in accordance with people's wishes. The status of certain newspapers must be changed, and affiliation with the party and state press must be delimited. One of the most important current questions is the role of the newspaper TIYESA and its responsibility for the party's cause. We must think about how to make the magazine KOMMUNIST more relevant and improve its theoretical level. The press today should devote principal attention to in-depth analysis of the political processes occurring in the republic, and not to superficial opinions.

It is obvious today that the development of the economy is increasingly lagging behind the pace of the democratization of society. This gap leads inevitably to crisis. Of course, without a sound economic basis, political autonomy is inconceivable. Therefore, the most radical changes are needed in this area. The Lithuanian CP Central Committee has formulated a clear-cut and unequivocal stand with respect to economic strategy—to follow a course of economic autonomy, and to establish a Lithuanian economy based on commodity-money relations. That is evident from the recently adopted Law on

the Foundations of Economic Autonomy. In our view, this is the only means of bringing the economy out of a state of stagnation.

However, this will not be easy to do. Lithuania's economy will have to be reformed under the conditions of unchanged production relations on the scale of the country as a whole. The questions of tactics, which are perhaps the main questions at the present stage, arise. They are being discussed by scholars, specialists and practitioners.

Unfortunately, we have not yet developed a clear-cut model for the functioning of the economy under the new conditions. Its preparation has been delayed. Blame for this lies with our economic departments, and the republic Council of Ministers and State Planning Committee should be working more actively. I think that a more intensively search must be made for ways to accelerate this work, and that a special position of deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers for the implementation of economic reform must be created. Legal support for the new economic mechanism is no less important. A number of normative acts regulating individual aspects of economic relations must be drawn up and adopted. Some of them are presently being worked on. This work must be sped up. Nonetheless, it must be stressed that today we already have a good many rights that are not being fully exercised. That is a great omission in the work of economic executives.

We intend to begin implementing radical changes in the economy at the beginning of next year. In this connection we constantly feel resistance on the part of central economic departments. The USSR Council of Ministers and Gosplan are unwilling to understand not only the economic importance of resolving these issues, but their political significance, as well. The position they are taking is contrary to sound logic.

The Food Program has acquired political weight today. In our view agrarian policy must be radically changed—economic relations in the countryside must be restructured, and the peasant must be made a proprietor who has a stake in increasing the production of output and improving its quality. Such a policy should be based on a diversity of forms of farming and socialist ownership. We are forced to reckon with the fact that the kolkhozes and sovkhoses presently produce approximately three-fourths of all agricultural output, and they are our principal providers today. The contribution of the new forms of farming that are being developed is still minor. Evidently this will be the case for a long time to come. The social form of production remains the principal one, and its accumulated potential must be better utilized.

We favor the individual peasant farm. It needs to have reliable legal guarantees that will help the peasant finally resolve to undertake independent farming. I think that the republic's parliament will provide such guarantees at

its upcoming session. Land should be allocated to peasant farms for free, for perpetual use, with the right of inheritance.

So the possibility is appearing in the countryside of choosing a means of farming that answers best to specific conditions and established traditions. But natural processes should not be artificially accelerated and opinions imposed from without. Let the various forms of production freely compete among themselves, and life will show which of them is the most efficient and most acceptable.

The establishment of new production relations requires improvement of the economic mechanism. We should work for a situation in which the entire agroindustrial complex and every specific producer work under the conditions of full cost accounting. For this purpose, better use must be made of pricing policy, relations with the budget, financing, credit, and other economic factors, and leveling and attitudes of dependency must be resolutely eliminated. The socioeconomic well-being of each collective should be directly dependent on the results of its work. It is necessary to change planning procedures and work out a system of economic levers that will give producers a stake in selling a greater quantity of high-quality output and ensure that state orders are filled.

In a situation in which the agroindustrial complex is autonomous, the management system must also be changed. The main thing is that the new structure be geared to the future and accord in its essence with the main principles of the economic reform and the aspirations of farmers. Management must be democratized and the autonomy of farms and enterprises expanded.

Life has shown that management of the present State Agroindustrial Committee is excessively centralized and cumbersome and that there is a great deal of duplication in it. Agriculture has not managed to be integrated with the processing industry in the management sphere. Amalgamation only detracts from the rights of the main administrations that were formed on the basis of the former ministries, and from their accountability for the situation in the branches. At the same time, there is a proposal to abolish the State Agroindustrial Committee.

For the management of agriculture, there are plans to establish a separate Ministry of Agriculture and, possibly, of the Food Industry, which will be financed by budget funds and will engage in developing proposals for the formation of food and raw-material resources and questions of their quality, the coordination of agricultural science, and its introduction into production, and will concern itself with land use, the training of specialists, foreign-trade relations, and other questions of agricultural development.

In order to enhance the soviets' influence on the solution of the food problem, it would be a good idea to establish agricultural administrations under raisspolkoms; these administrations would perform the functions of monitoring land use, product quality, the protection of labor

and technology; they would exercise financial and veterinary oversight, and they would build relations between the state and the producers on economic bases.

In order to accelerate the development of the processing branches of industry and the establishment of an agricultural service, autonomous republic state and cooperative production associations must be set up. Once independent, these branches would start to develop more dynamically, and their accountability for providing consumers with high-quality products and for providing services to producers would increase.

In order to coordinate the agroindustrial complex's system, it is planned to set up a special commission headed by the first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers.

In considering rural problems, I would like to single out one fundamental thing. Let us recall how Lithuanian farmers spoke with interest at both congresses about enhancing the peasant's prestige. Priority conditions must be created for the development of agricultural production and the solution of social problems in the countryside. This idea was cogently stressed at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, as well. I think that we should both recognize the priority of the agrarian complex and support it with actions. The contribution of other branches of the republic's economy to solving the food problem must be increased. In the present situation it is impossible to get by without this.

Today, in my view, there is no need to dwell in greater detail on the questions of agriculture, since these questions were discussed in detail yesterday in the Council of Ministers. Specific measures for resolving them have been outlined. So let us return to party affairs.

The tasks facing the Lithuanian CP demand the involvement of every communist in the realization of our aspirations. Only that will predetermine success. Therefore, in the opinion of the Bureau of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, we must begin intensive preparations for a conference or congress of the CP, develop a program of party actions, and resolve the questions of the status and independence of the Lithuanian CP. We should know the positions of members of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, the party committees and primary party organizations, and should listen to the opinion of all communists. That is why we deem it necessary to begin the discussion in the party. There should be no secondary questions in it.

We must discuss the questions of the keeping of records on communists, the accumulation and distribution of party funds, the application of the principles of democratic centralism in the party's life and the rights of the minority, and the means of forming elective bodies; and we must define the place and role of the party apparatus in a new fashion. Questions pertaining to the relationship between primary units and higher party bodies, personnel policy and the party press, and other problems are very important. We must reinterpret the forms of

cooperation between party organizations and trade-union, Komsomol and other public organizations and movements.

In this connection it is important not to forget the communist himself. We must concern ourselves first and foremost with how to create conditions for the disclosure of his potential for social activeness, and how to expand his rights and the possibilities for the effective implementation of the party's programmatic objectives.

Some party committees believe that the discussion of the party's independence has already been exhausted, since the problem of relations between the Lithuanian CP and the CPSU is already clear to them. But it is precisely the chief questions of intraparty life that they have forgotten to discuss. Therefore, we can only reaffirm our desire for an in-depth and comprehensive discussion on all questions pertaining to Lithuania's communists. There is no doubt but what the Lithuanian CP's programmatic goals in the area of the economy and the social and cultural spheres inevitably create the need for a new view of its relations with the CPSU. As we know, a great deal is being said about this. In this connection, today we should openly and unequivocally state that we are for the ideological unity of communists and the commonality of our ideals. But we intend to define the ways of realizing them for ourselves. The Lithuanian CP is striving to achieve its autonomy and independence in the solution of republic problems and, on the other hand, for its active and direct participation as a real factor in the formation of the CPSU's policy and practice on the scale of the USSR. We have no intention of isolating ourselves but, to the contrary, are striving to influence our political environment more decisively. I think that, in a state of sovereign union republics, the desire of their communist parties for independence is natural. It is a desire to proceed according to the interests of a sovereign republic's working people and the orientations that dominate in a society; and it is the need to use appropriate methods of political activity and to make restructuring irreversible. Of course, such a fundamental restructuring of relations with guiding bodies of the CPSU is not a matter to be accomplished in a single day. But it is our goal and, in my view, it accords with the content of restructuring in the CPSU as a whole. We realize that the provisions for the renewal of the Lithuanian CP are partly at odds with the CPSU's present Program and existing Statutes.

The times demand prompt decisions, but common sense suggests that restructuring in the party will take place in stages, in the areas of highest priority. Gradual changes will take place in not only the political but also the legal and social status of the organization as a whole and of each of its individual members.

The discussion that will be conducted in accordance with Paragraph 26 of the CPSU Statutes should not bring forth disorganizing phenomena in the party. I think that the party organizations will not take superficial and

arbitrary decisions, which could negatively affect the implementation of our plans.

I propose to the plenum of the republic's communists that the problem of the independence of the Lithuanian CP be discussed in July through September. It is desirable that proposals offered in the course of the discussion be clearly formulated. We should not forget that we ourselves will have to implement the provisions that we formulate together in the course of the discussion. What we sow, we shall reap. The discussion of the problems that have been enumerated will be more productive if the opinions of the primary organizations and individual communists are generalized by the party committees, and if only after that are the most valuable proposals transmitted to the Lithuanian CP Central Committee. A special working group will generalize them.

The Lithuanian CP, which has put forward in its documents and substantiated the slogan, "The people's plans are the party's plans!", is striving for the consistent and resolute implementation of that slogan.

As the result of the discussion, we should confirm this through a program of actions of the Lithuanian CP and through documents regulating intraparty life. How we do this, the course of the discussion will tell. Different variants are possible, including a conference or a congress. Proposals of this sort are already coming in.

While thinking about Lithuania's future and communists' role in building it, we are endeavoring to evaluate, in a sober and fully responsible fashion, the path that the party has covered. Our chief concern today is Lithuania's future and the well-being of its population. Without consolidation with all movements that support political and social restructuring, concrete activity will become very complicated. Our goal is constructive dialogue and the concerting of efforts for the good of Lithuania, not confrontation. Only by taking the path of democracy and of the priority of human values, the path of truth, will we be able to achieve the desired goal—the creation of a new Lithuania.

It is with this goal that we will arrive at the upcoming elections. They will become an extremely serious and important test of the path we have chosen. I believe that during this campaign we will make use of a Program of the Lithuanian CP that has been prepared through joint efforts and that will express our views on all of the important problems of the present day, such as Lithuania's statehood, the political system and multiple parties, the economic system and the forms of ownership, and many others.

We will support progressive individuals who think freely and boldly, take a clear and active civic stand, have appropriate competence, and have earned prestige and won people's respect. In our view, the view that was once expressed to the effect that the secretary of a party committee should invariably be the chairman of the newly elected soviet is not entirely correct.

Only a fundamental renewal of the party and the confident tread of restructuring will contribute to our party's durability and increase the attractiveness of its aspirations in people's eyes. The basis of all this is democratization of the party. Only in this way is the party capable of becoming the guarantor of a new Lithuania. We are convinced that such an understanding of the role of the Lithuanian CP, whether it be acceptable to everyone or not, is a political reality. Therefore, in reply to the arguments of opponents who reject our activity solely out of motives of national romanticism, I want to recall the warning of Stasis Shalkauskis, a prominent professor and former rector of Kaunas University imini Vitautas the Great: "The Lithuanian nation still stands, one might say, at the beginning of its national, state and, in general, spiritual and cultural rebirth. Therefore, we should avoid a one-sided solution of problems, which is often the consequence of an unthinking reaction to temporary failures. To give in to any single current and direct the nation's entire cultural creativity into that channel would mean an extremely great danger for Lithuania and, possibly, the downfall of all its lofty ideals."

Although these words were spoken 50 years ago and it was not a communist who spoke them, who will dispute their relevance for present-day Lithuania and for each of us?

Lithuanian Draft Constitution Discussed

*18001409 Vilnius SOBYTIYA I VREMYA in Russian
No 12, June 89, (signed to press 23 June 89) pp 2-4*

[Article by Kostas Malinauskas, assistant professor, candidate of philosophical sciences: "In the Interests of the Lithuanian State"]

[Text] The constitution is not only a fundamental legal document, but also a political one, which is used as a tool by any social class or nation to consolidate its power and its achievements on a specific historical path.

Sovereignty is the complete independence of a state or nation and its self-dependency in solving all questions of its internal and external life, which is not restricted by any other power or any external forces. The object of sovereignty is a nation as a specific universality. Only the nation itself can choose the directions, forms, goals and means of its public life. A nation, in and of itself, is both the meaning and the end, it predetermines the content and form of public life. At present, the national society integrated within the nation with its needs and interests, its state and culture is gaining this kind of sovereignty.

A nation as sovereign is the supreme expresser and fulfiller of its will. It can only achieve progress independently by creating a national state.

A national state is in essence a single-nation state, although it often has national minorities (national groups). From this point of view, the Lithuanian state

should become the main organizational instrument of the Lithuanian nation, the owner of its ethnic land, the creator of its culture, the expresser of its will and the ruler of its destiny on its native soil. By protecting the legal natural interests of the Lithuanian people, the democratic socialist Lithuanian state is also protecting all the national minorities living within it and integrating them into the indivisible society of Lithuania.

The need for a Constitution is arising with the emergence of a democratic state, and a state is necessary for the nation, for it is the main instrument for protecting its interests and the guarantor of its national life. According to I. Girnyus, the state is the home of the people, it is the place where they can feel safe.

The Constitution should be created in such a way that each of its statutes and words contributes to a strengthening of the nation-state, maintains order, improves the social structure, protects its needs, interests and territory, in short, ensures the optimal functioning and historical development of the nation. In this way, the Constitution is an expression of the nation's sovereignty.

Another methodological question is should the Constitution reflect the actual reality of the nation and state, that is, that which has already been achieved in public life, or those ideals toward which it must strive? When answering this question, we would do better to think about what kind of Constitution we want, what it should be. I think that the Constitution should establish a level of independence and freedom which can be achieved by the object of legal relations, on the whole, a level of social and political organization of the nation. But it would not be right to restrict its content to this, the Constitution should also partly reflect the social ideal.

What stage of the public life of Lithuania is being embodied in the draft of the new version of the Constitution? Although it does not qualitatively differ from the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR during Stalin's and Brezhnev's time, the very fact that it is being published is evidence of perestroika, national rebirth and the progressive activity of the Lithuanian movement toward perestroika of even the Communist Party. The draft reflects the first achievements of our social and democratic strengths: the national state symbols have returned, the frontiers of national and personal freedom have expanded and the trend toward the creation of a sovereign national state with an independent economy and culture is expressed.

We, and indeed neighboring republics, need time to become accustomed to the new realities of changing life.

Therefore, this draft of the Constitution also reflects the contradictions of our society: the influence of the old forces and the dictatorship of a "strong center", on the one hand, and the first achievements of the democratization of power and inexorable will of the nation, on the other.

The Constitution of Lithuania should be adopted without too much delay. The conservative, stagnant forces are still hoping for revenge, so any indecision and delay would play directly into their hands. At the critical moment, democratic forces might be deprived of their legal foundation. I think that the improved Constitution should be adopted no later than 1990. There is time to perfect it. By the way, the preamble also needs to be revised.

Of course, this new Constitution will reflect a transition period, the initial stage of the national and democratic revolution in Lithuania. So we will not be adopting the ideal Constitution anyway. You see, the transition from a semi-colonial state to national freedom and independence and from a semi-feudal social structure based on authoritarianism to a socialist, democratic transformation has only just begun.

It seems to me that when naming any state and its Constitution, there is no need to mention the character of the social structure and form of State power. Therefore, I suggest that the official name, "Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic", be replaced by "Lithuanian Republic", and "Constitution of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic" by "Constitution of the Lithuanian Republic". This short name for both the state and its Constitution is easier to say and write. And the main thing is that the essence does not suffer, Lithuania as the homeland of the Lithuanian ethnos: the structure and form of government may change, but Lithuania and the Lithuanians will remain.

I suggest formulating paragraphs 2, 4-6 of the preamble of the Constitution as follows: "The Lithuanian nation, which has decisively protected its freedom and independence for centuries, lost some of its ethnic land,

- threw off the colonial yoke in 123, regenerated its statehood in 1918, but lost it again in 1949 and was forcefully incorporated into the structure of the USSR,
- is creating a socialist democratic state at a new stage in historical development,
- is confirming the ideals of humanism and social justice, the ideals of individual and national freedom and independence...

Further, paragraphs 7 and 8 of the preamble should be changed in places. Paragraph 8 should be formulated as follows: "is striving to maintain the State independence of Lithuania and conditions for the historical survival and development of the national culture on the soil of our ancestors, adopt and proclaim this Constitution."

The draft of the Constitution to be published uses the term "Lithuanian people". Nevertheless, in socialist society, the nation is becoming a full, equal and universal object of social life. In society, where class and national antagonism have been destroyed, the concept of "people" is losing its meaning, it is becoming anonymous, therefore I suggest that when necessary it should

be replaced with "citizens of Lithuania" or "the Lithuanian nation." In this way, we are expressing a certain possession of individuals by the state or nation, on the whole, a national community. In many places, it is possible to manage without the concept of "people" at all and instead write "Lithuania" or "the Lithuanian state."

From this point of view, the proposed neologism "nationality of Lithuania" is inappropriate, for it combines different terms, "Lithuania" as a state (political) category or ethnonym and the concept "nationality", which expresses a social-ethnic form of human society. Lithuania is understood as a specific land or kray, as a state, and the Lithuanians are the main ethnic inhabitants of this kray, state. But people of other nationalities also live in Lithuania. Therefore, we talk about the "Lithuanian nation" and not the "nationality of Lithuania."

I suggest that the concept "legal state" be replaced in the draft of the Constitution by the broader term "democratic legal" or "parliamentary state." It is important to note in the Constitution that the Lithuanian republic is a unitary state, as individual groups of some national groups (minorities) are striving toward territorial and ethnic dissidence and toward the creation of something similar to the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Federal Republic.

I suggest that the first article of the Constitution of the Lithuanian Republic be formulated as follows: "The Lithuanian Republic is a sovereign socialist (democratic) unitary state expressing the common will and interests of all its citizens." The second article should be formulated as follows: "All power in the Lithuanian Republic comes from the sovereign rights of the Lithuanian nation and belongs to it."

"The Lithuanian nation and all the citizens of Lithuania express their sovereign will by electing the Councils of Peoples' Deputies..."

In the sixth article of the draft, the *avante garde* role of the Lithuanian Communist Party is formulated traditionally as an integral part of the CPSU. Democratic thinking requires that this problem also be considered anew. I suggest the following context: "There is a multi-party system in the Lithuanian Republic. All political parties function with equal rights without violating the Constitution of the Lithuanian Republic and its sovereignty."

While striving toward sovereignty, the nation should become the fully empowered master of its territory (and air space), its land, its resources and all the material goods and spiritual treasures created on its soil, it should determine and define the content and form of its political, economic and spiritual life, and its ways and means of action. Article 11 should also include the following: "tourism and the development of resorts and their material base are the republic's possession and are within its competence."

Without any intermediaries, a sovereign nation supports international ties and decides all questions of external life, that is, it should also be an object of international relations. In accordance with the Agreement, some international affairs will be decided by the agencies of the USSR.

Historical experience also confirms the truth that national sovereignty will become fiction if the nation does not have the opportunity to protect itself from outside enemies or protect its interests in the international arena. Therefore, the formulation of the 4th chapter of the Constitution draft seems very unfavorable to me: "External political activity and protection of the socialist Homeland." This chapter should indicate the level at which Lithuania supports international ties, that is, explain that these contacts encompass not only economics, science and culture, but also the spheres of politics and ideology. Article 79 roughly states that Lithuania "has the right to enter into relations with foreign states" etc. Nevertheless, it should state that, if necessary, it may establish relations with them. In Article 30, it should be stated that "... national troops are being formed in the Lithuanian Republic..." and that "their deployment and use beyond the borders of the Lithuanian Republic should only be decided by the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic."

The title of the 7th chapter of the Constitution draft of the Lithuanian SSR sounds illogical: "The Lithuanian SSR is a sovereign state within the structure of the USSR", for the nation and state cannot be sovereign within the structure of another state. In Article 72, it should be stated precisely that Lithuania may withdraw from the structure of the USSR: by means of a democratic referendum (if two thirds of the citizens of the Lithuanian Republic are in favor of its withdrawal). In Article 73, it should be added that "the laws of the USSR and other acts of the supreme agencies of governmental power and administration of the USSR are in effect on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR...if they are approved at a session of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic or at a meeting of the Council of Ministers of Lithuania."

The statement in the Constitution that one third of the peoples' deputies of Lithuania are elected from public organizations is also undemocratic. This system should be abolished. In my opinion, there should be 130 deputies in the structure of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic elected by means of direct, equal and secret ballot. Lithuania is not very large and does not require a parliamentary system with a multitude of stages.

In the fifth section of the Constitution draft of the republic it should state that all officials within the ministries, committees, administrations of the Lithuanian SSR, courts and procurators' offices, including the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Committee of State Security and the national military associations, should be named and approved only by the supreme agencies of

the government of the Lithuanian Republic and are subordinate to them. In the second section of the Constitution, there should be an article or item which indicates that armies or special troops (excluding the police) in the Lithuanian Republic are forbidden to use physical force against the citizens. An article should also be introduced, which still existed in the ancient Roman republic, that deploying and bringing military troops into the capital of the Lithuanian state is forbidden.

Article 32, which states that "citizens of other socialist republics enjoy the same rights as citizens of the Lithuanian SSR on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR", should be abolished as contradictory to the concept of sovereignty. Article 74 should state that "the territory of Lithuania is inviolable and indivisible." There should be a small correction to Article 19 that the Lithuanian Republic supports ties with Lithuanians living outside Lithuania and if necessary protects them.

The published draft of the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR still requires good editing, for it contains a great many linguistic, conceptual and contextual inaccuracies. However, what has been accomplished is only the beginning of the path toward creating a sovereign, national state and toward social progress. We are gradually moving toward freedom and independence. As Lithuanian society is improved, so will its Constitution be improved.

No matter how important it is to the nation to have a Constitution which expresses and protects its ideals and interests, its role should still not be made absolute. It is important not only to pronounce the sovereignty of Lithuania, but also to determine the forms and means of its realization. The most wonderful Constitution may be ineffective if democratic attitudes do not suffuse our entire lives and if we do not have a political, moral and, on the whole, elevated spiritual culture.

COPYRIGHT: "Sobytiya i vremya", 1989.

Conferees Discuss Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact

18001449 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in
Russian 13 Jul 89 p 2

[V. Ivanov compilation of materials: "The Difficult Path of Knowledge"]

[Text] Various jubilees are marked in the history of mankind. They also include those that take place without the carnival parades and flowers and congratulations. We are marking one such date now: the 50th anniversary of the signing of several documents between the USSR and Hitler's Germany in 1939, sometimes conventionally lumped together under the general name of the "Molotov-Ribbentrop pact." And whereas the nonaggression treaty itself does not usually evoke any special disagreements in its assessment, the discussion continues about the secret protocols to the treaty and to other treaties of the same period.

There is probably no people on the planet, no state whose historical path has been strewn with roses. But let us agree that painful and bitter as the pits and bumps and the thorns along that path were, the loud and hypocritical assurances to the contrary were worse; and how much more bitter it is to find in reality that they did exist, and do exist, and that even today their consequences can be felt.

How little we still know about our own history and how much we still have to learn of it—ABOUT IT! It is a difficult and painful process: we have to change our usual ideas for what is sometimes exactly the opposite. But it must be done. Otherwise the reading will be distorted and the entire scale of values shifted.

In this sense a step—a small step, only one of the first, but a necessary one, and in the right direction—was taken by the international conference "A Legal Assessment of the 23 August 1939 and 28 September 1939 Treaties Between Germany and the USSR" held in Tallinn on 30 June and 1 July under the aegis of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law and the Estonian academic union of legal experts. The republic newspapers have published quite full and detailed accounts of the statements by those attending the conference. In addition, SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA has an agreement with experts in our republic, and also in Latvia, Lithuania, Belorussia, and the Ukraine, who have agreed to present for publication in the near future materials from their own research on this subject.

Today we familiarize our readers with the opinions of some of the conference participants and guests, expressed during interviews with SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA.

NOT EMOTION BUT REASON Should Prevail in the Approach to the Solution of This Question

—this is what Reyn Myullerson, doctor of legal sciences and member of the UN Committee on Human Rights, thinks.

[Myullerson] If you take the first report, presented at the conference by Kheykki Lindpere, then we may assert that it was both constrained and calm, and scientific in tone.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] At the suggestion of deputies from the Baltic the Union of USSR People's Deputies set up a special commission to make a final assessment of the treaties (and the secret protocols to them) between the USSR and Germany immediately before WWII. Do you think that the work of the conference today will be considered an integral part of the large-scale activity that is now under way in reviewing this aspect of our history?

[Myullerson] Legally, of course, it is not part of the work of the Congress commission. The commission will do its work regardless of us. And whether or not our statements here will be considered is a matter for the commission. But in principle the Tallinn conference is part of the chain of events whose aim is to clarify **what the reality was**. And to provide answers for the future: how shall we act henceforth?

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Tell us, do you maintain more or less regular links with this work in the republic's scientific community?

[Myullerson] Not as regularly or as constantly as I would like. But in general we do cooperate. Most often when jurists from Tallinn and Tartu go to Moscow. We meet and discuss the results of our research in a particular field. Indeed, most of them are my friends: I know Lindpere very well; and the former dean of the law faculty at the Tartu State University, Rakhumaa (who is now working in Sweden)..

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] I, of course, am an amateur in the field of international law, and in jurisprudence in general—as indeed the overwhelming majority of citizens are. And I can judge more of what is being said at the domestic level. And from this standpoint the experience of these last months shows that unmasking the crimes of Stalinism, deliberately or not, directly or indirectly, imposes a burden of responsibility and blame (and this applies in particular to the national republics) on almost the entire non-indigenous population. According to some inexplicable logic, it turns out that by association it is precisely the Russian-speaking population that "brought" the Stalinist repressions to Estonia; naturally this does not help in improving the moral atmosphere. How can this be avoided?

[Myullerson] The generations alive now, of course, are not to blame for what our leaders did **then**. And I do not think that the Georgians, for example, should feel any guilt for the fact that Stalin and Beriia were born in Georgia. Emotional people are probably sometimes inclined to identify the leaders then with the people on whose behalf those leaders spoke (mostly the Russian people, behind whose name both Stalin and those in his

closest entourage loved to hide themselves). It is difficult! People must be educated—politically and morally—to understand that no single people is responsible for the crimes of the rulers. But this must be done by representatives of the same nation. That is, it is Estonians who should explain to Estonians the impermissibility of an intolerant attitude toward other peoples and nations. It is the same with other population groups. If, for example, we could find among the supporters of Interdizheniye people who fought consistently against national intolerance in their **own** milieu, this would do a great deal of good.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Yes, I agree with you. And much more than unconditional and one-sided defense of the interests **ONLY** of the Russian-speaking population...

[Myullerson] And would help in overcoming the split on these grounds that has unfortunately occurred.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] And how do you regard the idea of using the testimony as a means of cleansing the conscience?

[Myullerson] In principle I share this idea. But it applies to everyone, not just to one or several peoples and nations. It seems to me that to some extent this cleansing should be served by the work of the commission of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies to assess the "Molotov-Ribbentrop pact." And the adoption of a decision by the Supreme Soviet in which the practice of secret agreements between governments behind the backs, **and at the expense** of their own and other peoples, would be condemned.

Incidentally, here is an interesting observation: here in the republic many people were displeased by my article in PRAVDA ("Forward into... the Past." 22 May this year—editor's note) because in it I criticized certain documents adopted by the Baltic Assembly. On the other hand I received many letters whose authors abused me for the fact that I had dared to criticize the foreign policy of Stalin and Molotov just before the war. People react very differently...

Of course, it is impossible to please everyone. But at this time, when revolutionary changes are taking place in the country and when sharp turns are being made, a balanced approach often provokes irritation and a reluctance to apprehend it.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] That is, that same old principle comes into play: whoever is not with us is against us! Or we still hear the "direct question": and what side of the barricade are you on?! Alas, this stereotype will probably be with us for a long time, and it contains what is perhaps the ugliest aspect of the legacy of Stalinism that has come down to us.

AGGRESSIVENESS IS FUTILE

Professor (Eugeniush Durachinski) of the Polish People's Republic and the Polish Academy of Sciences Institute of History:

[Durachinski] Regardless of **what** the past was, whom it affects, and how far removed it is from us, a survey of the historical past, with all its complexity and multiform nature, has its own law-governed rules. I would distinguish three more or less general planes on which history and its events are usually considered. The first is that a person wants to know **what the reality was**. If he already knows this, then the following question comes to the surface: **Why** was it so? But perhaps there were no different scenarios and everything in the world is determined in a law-governed way, that is, is predetermined and stipulated? Incidentally, in vulgar Marxism, of which Stalin was the "coryphaeus," this is precisely the interpretation of history...

And finally, the third plane: was what happened **moral or amoral**? This postulation of the problem is especially typical of mankind at the end of the 20th century; I think it is the consequence of WW2. Moral assessment of the legacy of all preceding policy and the history of the first half of the century. Without it we could not move into the 21st century or pass on the baton to succeeding generations.

From positions of this kind of agreement, the entire **package**, as is now said, of documents signed by the Soviet Union and Hitler's Germany immediately before the war is a key event in European (and I would even dare to say world) politics during the first half of our century.

And so when we consider any particular event in history from the positions of the how and the why and whether or not it was moral, there may be aggressiveness in the assessment. Particularly if the events were dramatic, even tragic, and if they affect the interests our people and those closest to us... and so forth.

But even if the grounds for this aggressiveness can be fully understood, in and of itself the aggressiveness is futile and leads to nothing positive. If a person really wants to **know** something then for him aggressiveness is the number one enemy; it deforms views and distorts the picture.

And since here in Tallinn we are looking at a very complex and key question of politics during the first half of the 20th century, we are obligated to be extremely objective. We are doing our work in order to to learn **THE TRUTH**. But we also cannot avoid the **assessment** of those events. And, taking into account the fact that the treaties between Germany and the USSR involved colossal negative consequences for very many peoples, we are forced to recognize that it is a question of collusion between Stalin's imperialism and Hitler's fascism.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] It seems to me that here a quite accurate assessment was given at the conference by R. Myullerson in his statement, when he said that in the agreements of that time the **FORM** and **METHODS** of government under the two despotisms played a greater role than differences in the social and class structure of the two states and in their ideologies.

[Durachinski] Yes, I also agree with that viewpoint.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Tell us, professor, what is your attitude toward the opinion of those experts who believe that the rise of Hitlerism and of fascism in general were not simply vagaries of history but merely a focusing embodiment of the Machiavellian principle that "morality and politics are incompatible," which dominated at that time in Europe, a degeneration of Plato, who asserted that politics is inconceivable outside of morality?

[Durachinski] Yes, I have heard that opinion expressed on more than one occasion and there is some truth in it. In fact, by the time that fascism, Nazism and Stalinism had risen, European politics already had nothing, or almost nothing, in common with morality. And because of this, as we assess those events from the positions of our awareness today, we should not measure everything using only today's yardsticks. On the one hand, however, if everything is oversimplified then what do we have?: if a neighbor steals something it is not obligatory that I should also steal... The French say "tout comprendre c'est tout pardonner." So I fear that being too fascinated by this explanation—the triumph of Machiavellianism—may lead to the justification of crimes.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] I agree with you: what is important here is not to go beyond the boundary of what is reasonable.

[Durachinski] That is, pay attention to the general atmosphere in the politics of the period but not absolutize this principle.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] In the second issue this year of the journal *RODINA* the historian Viktoriya Chalikova writes on this subject: "it is not just we who should be sorry for this," having in mind that directly or indirectly Britain and France the the United States helped in the rise of fascism and Stalinism...

[Durachinski] With respect to the concept of "being sorry" I think that **peoples** have nothing to be sorry for. The ones who should be sorry are the politicians who commit the crimes, or their successors. To the point, this is also a very complicated question: who may be considered the direct successors of that period in Germany? who gained the inheritance of Stalin?... This is a very complicated question.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Professor, you are probably aware that in our official historiography, until recently the events in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia in June through August 1940 were interpreted exclusively

as a peaceful, bloodless, socialist, revolutionary, the free will of the working masses. Today we increasingly hear voices asserting the contrary: that it was, unambiguously, the occupation of the sovereign Baltic states by the Soviet Union. What is your opinion?

[Durachinski] I do not know the history of Estonia in that period very well. But from those sources with which I am familiar I would conclude that the question devolves in many respects on the annexation of the Baltic area by the Soviet Union (today we may conclude that the grounds for this were the secret agreements on the division of spheres of influence between Hitler and Stalin—editor's note). But I would not completely disregard the forces and movements that were being born at that time in the Baltic states and had a communist orientation. I do not overestimate their importance and capabilities, but neither am I about to deny their role entirely. Undoubtedly there was some minor rather than strong impulse from within that slowly gained support from the outside.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] And a final question, of a personal nature. You speak Russian beautifully. How did you learn the language?

[Durachinski] That is perhaps the simplest question of all to answer: I graduated from the Moscow State University.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Thank you for the interview.

RESPONSIBILITY RESTS WITH THE POLITICIANS

this is what doctor of legal sciences, professor Dietrich Loeber of the University of Kiel (FRG) thinks.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Herr Professor, at the conference there was a great deal of talk about the problem of who should be considered the successors of the parties who took part in the signing of the 1939 treaties and the secret protocols to them. What do you think about this?

[Loeber] A mass of research papers have been written on this subject, along with a whole library of special literature. The German empire capitulated in the spring of 1945 and all power on its former territory was transferred to the forces of occupation. Then two independent states were created on German soil, and each of them will exist until a peace treaty is concluded between them (and that time is not yet), where the question of succession should also be stipulated.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] But another aspect (although from the legal standpoint it is undoubtedly much clearer than in the case with the German side) is this: can the present government of the USSR with complete justification be regarded as the successor of the Stalinist regime?

[Loeber] Jurists make a clear distinction when it is a question of the replacement of a state order (for example, Soviet Russia replaced tsarist Russia in the international arena, and then the USSR—that is, a new state), and when it is simply the natural process of replacement of a government. In the case that we are discussing now, the **state** remains one and the same—the Soviet Union.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Jurists, sociologists, and demographers are today conducting a debate on the consequences of the conclusion of the treaty between Germany and the USSR, and in particular the secret protocols to the official documents, relying on facts and scientific analysis, from what I would call an academic position. But even among the experts there is not total agreement here: how to interpret particular facts, what conclusions to draw. And what of a mass audience that does not possess an adequately solid foundation of knowledge and is guided by emotion?! And so at the "everyday" level mutual claims and abuse arise... I do not want to repeat them just to open old and sore wounds. But how do we avoid the discomfort that a significant part of the population is experiencing, when it is neither specifically to blame nor responsible for what happened?

[Loeber] I understand what you are saying. Yes, there are those who advocate the idea of collective responsibility, and they exist in the West, including in the FRG. There is also the theory that most Germans are to blame for the fact that Germany (under Hitler) was the aggressor and unleashed WW2.

I categorically disagree with this theory. It is impossible indiscriminately to blame an entire nation or any people for what its rulers do. In each particular case responsibility can only be strictly individual.

What has been said might also to some extent apply to the situation in the Baltic, and for you in Estonia. The people who came here during the postwar years are not to blame for the fact that these territories were virtually annexed by Stalin in 1939-1940... And no one has the right to demand their forcible resettlement. It is another matter if they themselves express a desire to do so.

I specialize in the field of comparative law, and I can cite a relative analogy from the FRG, where about 2 million foreign workers live, mostly Turks. Of course, no state has an interest in having too many foreigners living on its territory. But if those people have already taken out FRG citizenship then there can be absolutely question of deporting them. Only those who have committed crimes can be forcibly deported, and then only if they do not have citizenship. And so, even if a person is not a citizen but does have permission to live, or has lived, in the country for 5 years (or 10 years, I do not remember exactly) then the FRG government may provide financial assistance for his return to his own country—**only with the voluntary agreement** of the person himself, and he must **prove** the sincerity of his intention to leave the FRG. Of course, the analogy, I repeat, is a distant one

since there it is in fact a question of **foreign** subjects living in another state, while here it is one of a single citizenship for all those living in the USSR...

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Herr Professor, what would your attitude be toward the idea of creating autonomous territorial-ethnic formations within the Estonian SSR? Today voices can be heard proposing the following approach: establish these kinds of autonomous areas in localities where there is a compact non-Estonian population, in the northeast of the republic.

[Loeber] From the standpoint of international law there is nothing unusual in this. But we should not forget the realities. As far as I know at one time the territory of the Estonian republic extended to the east somewhat farther than the border of today's Estonian SSR. And the Estonians who remember that have quite justified misgivings that with the creation of a Northeast autonomous oblast or region with a predominantly non-Estonian population, an area where they, the indigenous nation on that land, will thus be curtailed even more...

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Of course, it is impossible to disagree with you that while showing concern for the comfort of the non-indigenous population no harm is done to the moral status of the indigenous population. This is axiomatic. But can some kind of stable balance of interests be achieved here?

[Loeber] I think it can, given good will. It seems to me that if the Russian-speaking population can identify itself with the land on which it lives, with the culture and history of its people, and with its language and customs, then the process of eliminating the contradictions will be less painful.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Here, too, I agree with you in principle. But there are nuances here. For example, in the city of Narva, where less than 10 percent of the population is Estonian, I have heard the following: fine, people were saying at the enterprise that today we are learning the Estonian language, which is now the official language, and we are complying with the requirements of the law. But with whom shall we speak in Estonian? And so how long will we keep the knowledge we have gained?

[Loeber] But once again we must distinguish the specific conditions. If a person holds a post in which he has to deal with the public, and this includes speaking in Estonian, then there can be no question about it here—he must also know the language of the indigenous population. Otherwise he is simply unsuitable for that job from the professional viewpoint. With regard to, say, clerical work, well, as far as I know, in bourgeois Estonia there was a law on cultural autonomy, according to which in compact areas where people of different nationality lived, with the permission of the local authorities the language used for clerical work was the language of the nation that was in a majority there.

But this, of course, did not deprive the Estonian living there of the right to use his own language and demand that people spoke with him and conducted correspondence with him in Estonian. So that the languages were equal. The same can be said about localities where the Swedish population, the German population and so forth lived. It seems to me that it was a very liberal and democratic solution to the problem.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Incidentally, if you do not mind my asking, how do you know Russian so well?

[Loeber] First, I was born in Riga; our family was one of the Baltic German families. And I learned Russian along with other languages in school. Moreover, I have for many years been studying the history of Soviet-German relations, and I had to master the language in order to familiarize myself with the sources...

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Thank you very much for the interview.

WHAT WAS SECRET IS BECOMING KNOWN

Doctor of historical sciences, senior scientific associate at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the USA and Canada, former personal interpreter to V. Molotov and I. Stalin, Valentin Berezhkov.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Valentin Mikhaylovich, how do you assess the two days of work at the conference at which you were a witness and participant?

[Berezhkov] I was invited to attend because the subject was the events of 1939 and their consequences, in which I was to some degree involved when I was working in the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs.

In my opinion, it was a useful conference since it gave scientific workers and experts an opportunity to share the results of their own research on the period and exchange opinions, and thus make a definite contribution to the preparations to resolve the questions being dealt with by the commission specially set up by the Congress of People's Deputies.

Although for me personally it is not very clear why some of those attending the conference were so insistent in demanding that **all the documents and protocols of that period be considered void. Well, how considered void? The protocol (on spheres of influence—editor's note)? Fine, one can say that it is simply a piece of paper. There was no Molotov. No Ribbentrop, no Stalin. Germany invaded the USSR and this broke the nonaggression treaty and everything that accompanied it... But what is the consequence of this?**

One speaker compared it to the action of a mighty bandit who puts a pistol to my head and so has a right... Notwithstanding, it was by "might is right" that, although part of East Prussia, Silesia went to Poland and Koenigsberg to the USSR... If all of this is considered as "might is right" and on this basis is made void, then—and I said this in my own speech—we must deal in this

way with the first secret protocol, which gave Vilnius to Lithuania. And if it is a question of making void not only the **paper itself but also its consequences, then by rights Poland should demand the return of its Vilno district. And perhaps also west Belorussia, and the western Ukraine? And should Germany demand the return of Silesia?**

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Yes, if one stone is moved here we have the danger of an avalanche...

[Berezhkov] And this is why one is discouraged by the insistence of such calls—rescind, denounce, deem all documents void. I personally do not fully understand this: what lies behind these demands?

Ultimately the right of each union republic to secede from the USSR is written into the Constitution. And we may talk about this formally, but how will it be realized? For we are closely bound together. Ultimately even by the low level of our technology, and we are linked by the wretched quality of our industrial output... It is therefore my impression that all such talk is coated with a layer of fantasy, some kind of agitation.

In other things, however, it seems to me that the conference was undoubtedly useful.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Tell us what was for you new or surprising in the new aspect of this? What did you get from its work? For you were nevertheless privy to the "secret of the court" and knew more than mere mortals. Did your participation in **this** scientific conference give you anything?

[Berezhkov] What I took away from the conference was a confirmation of what I had thought previously, and now I am more than ever convinced that it is impossible to try to hide **what really happened**. Whatever is secret will sooner or later become public.

Of course, we can still argue about the photocopies of the secret protocols that were found in the West after the war: whether they are accurate down to the last word or whether someone cut and pasted other lines. But to insist that the whole thing was a forgery... This approach would signify the continuation of attempts to hide something. We must be realists. Was there a non-aggression pact? There was. After that did we in "some way" immediately conclude treaties about the Baltic countries? Yes, we did. Did Soviet troops move into the western Ukraine and Belorussia? Yes, they did. And they made contact with Wehrmacht troops. Does this mean that it had somewhere been stipulated where this contact would take place but not signify a **clash**?

We have already told so many lies that it is time to make an end to this, time to stop "burying the evidence." And it seems to me that this conference once again confirmed this need.

[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA] Valentin Mikhaylovich, does it conjugate somehow that you yourself were a witness to an indisputable fact of the existence of the secret protocols? In other words, can it be concluded

from what you personally know that these protocols really do exist and that their content is exactly what you have told us?

[Berezhkov] Well, you see, I myself heard Molotov talking with Hitler and making reference to an additional protocol. This means that there was a protocol.

But I would dwell on this factor. And it was also mentioned at the conference: it is impossible to approach exclusively with today's yardstick the actions and decisions of states and politicians of that time. For then, the essence of what was happening was the creation of a future front. It was clear to everyone that sooner or later war would break out between Hitler's Germany and the USSR. It is another matter that Stalin miscalculated, based his reliance on this, and failed to take into account the guile of his "partner" (as R. Myullerson neatly expressed it, Satan outwitted the Devil—editor's note). But war was inevitable, and so each side was trying to find the most favorable conditions, positions and prospects for itself. Of course, in such moments—the eve of the terrible catastrophes that WW2 became, when tens of millions of people were killed—moral problems move to the background. It can probably be said that no, we will not seize area of the western Ukraine and Belorussia because they are Polish territory.. What then, let the German army move straight to Minsk? To Kiev?

It is always essential to bear in mind the real situation in the period in which the events took place, that is, not absolutize it, but not ignore it either.

So, we have acquainted you, briefly, with the opinion of just four of those attending the conference. And not so much directly about the subjects of the reports and statements but rather on the questions and problems stemming from them, as applied to our situation today.

And even a cursory acquaintance with the positions of the experts shows how different views can be on the same

fact among people who, it would seem, have drawn their knowledge from the same source. For example, in his speech at the congress Professor Loeber drew the attention of his colleagues to a purely legal aspect: from what moment should the secret protocols to the treaties between Germany and the USSR be considered void? From the moment that they were signed? But all subsequent events stem from the protocols... From the moment of Germany's attack on the Soviet Union? And again there were calls to denounce the secret protocols. But only what has been officially recognized and does exist can be denounced. And if it is deemed legally insignificant (such a term does exist) from the moment that it was signed, then there is nothing to denounce...

On the other hand, however, it is precisely the **RANGE** of opinions and judgments, as Professor Durachinski put it, that can and should serve as a guarantee for the objective assessments that are made. If, of course, this range includes constructive and realistic positions. However, even when we encounter extreme opinions, even if the strength of the arguments and of the intellect is decisive in the discussion, there is no strength of threat, even less "from a position of strength."

In the novel "The Master and Margarita" by Mikhail Bulgakov the itinerant philosopher Yeshua asserts that "it is easy and pleasant to speak the truth." It would seem that today, when we turn to the truth of our own history, these words might seem nothing more than a beautiful sentence but devoid of real meaning. What is easy, and even more pleasant, when it is a question of crimes?!

Nevertheless, the personage "not of this world" was quite right in a worldly way: he whose conscience and thoughts are clean need have nothing of which to be ashamed, nothing to hide. This is **TRUTH**. It is the **LIE** that is difficult and bitter to admit. Today a great deal depends on you and me in order to make it easy and pleasant for present and future generations to speak the truth.

Latvian Supreme Court Rehabilitates Cardinal Vaivods

*18001279a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
15 Jun 89 p 4*

[Unattributed report: "Cardinal Rehabilitated"]

[Text] A regular session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Court was held June 12 under the chairmanship of G. Zemribo, Chairman of the republic Supreme Court. Among other court cases considered was an appeal filed by J. Vilders, First Deputy Chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Court. It concerned the decision handed down by the republic Supreme Court's judicial collegium for criminal cases on May 13, 1958, under which Julian Izidorovich Vaivods was sentenced to two years' deprivation of freedom under article 58(10), part one, of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

Under that decision, J. Vaivods was found guilty and convicted of having personally written, from 1942 to 1954, while serving as a priest, dean, and general vicar of the Liyepaya Catholic Diocese, a number of religious books of anti-Soviet content. These included such works as "To Labor And To Rest" in three volumes, a two-volume work entitled "Homilies For All Sundays of the Year," "Short Sermons For All Sundays of the Year and Feastdays" in two volumes, and "History of Latvian Catholic Churches" in four volumes.

In his works, the decision states, Vaivods sought to refute Marxist-Leninist theory, slandered Soviet reality and leaders of the Communist Party, as well as kolkhoz reality and methods of raising children in the Soviet Union, inaccurately portrayed teaching on the origin of man, and glorified the bourgeois order in Latvia. The court also found him guilty of giving his works to other priests to read. At the same time, experts who have studied J. Vaivods' works in detail have not concluded that, through his works, he called for the overthrow, undermining, or weakening of Soviet power, or for the commission of counterrevolutionary crimes.

The Supreme Court Presidium, after examining the materials of the case and hearing the conclusion of Latvian SSR Deputy Procurator A. Reyniyeks, who agreed with the appeal, resolved that the judicial collegium's decision of May 13, 1958, with respect to Vaivods is illegal and unjust. The Presidium disaffirmed the decision and dismissed the criminal case.

LATINFORM correspondent V. Sebyakin asked Supreme Court member L. Pluksna to comment.

"The curia of the Riga metropolitan recently requested that we determine, by way of oversight, whether the cardinal was convicted rightly," Leontina Ignatyevna began her remarks. "And according to existing procedure, we reexamined this case. On reviewing its materials, one readily discerns the 'handwriting' of investigators of the Beria school. They sought at any cost to

discredit the dedicated minister and to portray him as an enemy of the state. Yes, in the view of the apparatus of repression and violence, he was a very real enemy. Yet when one reads his works and tries to assess them from the standpoint of today's policies of glasnost and restructuring, one marvels at how sincere and truthful the minister was in those somber times (remember, he wrote his 'seditious' works largely during the period of raging Stalinism). Thus, he wrote that he was opposed to keeping children in children's homes, that every child needs the warmth of a family environment. This was presented as slander of the methods of rearing children in the Soviet Union. Vaivods told about the normal life that believers led in Latvia prior to the restoration of Soviet power in Latvia, and for that he was accused of glorifying the bourgeois order. Like all of us today, he considered the practices of the postwar years to be antihumanitarian and made no attempt to conceal his negative view of them."

The reaction of the members of the republic Supreme Court Presidium was therefore natural. They voted unanimously to support the appeal. The resolution adopted at the session, as well as the 34 surviving books that served as "material evidence" (one can only regret that this is by no means all of those confiscated) will be turned over to Julian Vaivods in the next few days, L. Pluksna said in conclusion.

Church Built By Boris Godunov Conducts Religious Services

*18001279b Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian
6 May 89 p 7*

[Article by I. Serebryakov: "Boris Godunov's Church"]

[Text] There is still no altar or iconostasis in the church, but services are being held nonetheless.

Trinity Church in the village of Khoroshevo was built in 1598 by order of Boris Gudunov on his own estate. An oral legend has it that Czar Boris was crowned in the church, but the church's value lies in something else. Besides the fact that it is the only church among the Godunov buildings to survive in Moscow, the church is noted for its unusual acoustics, and its contours largely echo the features of the Donskoy Monastery's Old Cathedral. For many years the church served only as an architectural landmark, but just recently a decision was taken to make it an operating church.

The walls have yet to be stuccoed, and the parvis is littered with construction debris, for restoration work is still under way; nor is everything finished inside the church. But Easter services were held all the same and marked a kind of holiday for those who went there. Some were drawn by religion, others by the history of their national culture. But it was a holiday for all just the same.

Major Journal Editors Describe Publication Plans**ZNAMYA Editor Baklanov**

18001411 LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 12,
19 July 89

[Article by G. Baklanov, editor in chief of ZNAMYA:
"And What About You?"]

[Text] *Almost since the year began, readers of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA have been requesting the editorial staff to describe the plans of the literary journals of the USSR Writers Union and the major journals of the RSFSR Writers Union for 1990. Their impatience is easily understandable; for competition in the past three years has been intense and the selection process extremely difficult.*

The department of literary affairs requested the editors-in-chief of the literary monthlies to answer the following questions:

1. Did you manage to complete everything planned?
2. Which published work in your view was the most successful?

We have succeeded in doing almost everything planned. We have not been able to publish a new novel by V. Bogomolov and a book by I. Dubinskiy entitled "Special Account." V. Bogomolov has not yet finished his novel; he is continuing to work on it, and we hope to publish it next year. We were planning to bring out I. Dubinskiy's book at the end of this year, but as it turned out he submitted it to the publishing house on time, or even ahead of time. It will soon appear in print.

Moreover, we have published a number of works that were not announced in advance—among them let me mention "The Faithful Ruslan" by G. Vladimov and, before that, the correspondence of B. Pasternak and A. Efron. So it will be in the future. Works of journalism are timely matters, and not everything can be planned in advance. And, of course, one cannot anticipate the appearance of new names. Among those appearing for the first time in the pages of ZNAMYA, I will mention first of all O. Yermakov and his stories of Afghanistan. They stirred a lively reader response and were highly praised in the press. Right now the editorial staff has a new collection of stories by O. Yermakov that we will be bringing out.

2. I am unable to decide the answer to the question: Which published work was the most successful? Unquestionably, in every issue there is substantive material, whether in the form of a short novel, social or political reporting, poetry, or a work of criticism. In principle, everything is supposed to be worthy of interest, so that the reader can choose according to his personal taste what primarily interests him. Today journals are read in different ways. Some people begin with the letters to the editors; others begin with political reporting or the verse. This is a time of intense concern, and people are looking

for answers to questions. Thus social and political journalism with direct coverage of sensitive issues occupies a prominent place. There was a time when readers read the serialized novels one issue after another, and the rest remained undiscovered. But even with all the diversity of views regarding one problem or another, an issue of the journal, one should think, would have compositional unity. A literary work, for example, should have its own subject, its own principal theme. Of course, this is so only ideally.

3. Actually, I already began to respond to the third question addressed to us. It is the one, it must be supposed, of most interest to subscribers. I mentioned the novel of V. Bogomolov, which we hope to publish next year, and I spoke, too, of the short stories of O. Yermakov. Readers who remember V. Karpov's "The Military Commander" will greet his new novel "Marshal Zhukov" with no less enthusiasm. The author has turned over to us the manuscript, which will be printed in three issues of the journal. B. Mozhayev is engaged in finishing a new novel for us. Two years ago we published the first prose work of N. Shmelev, and next year we will publish a new short novel of his—this time a historical novel. At the same time, as in past years, we will be publishing pieces of political journalism by N. Shmelev. Plans for next year include short and longer novels by I. Drutse, F. Iskander, V. Kondratyev, A. Kurchatkin, B. Makenin, A. Pristavkin, A. Anfinogenov, and A. Azolskiy, as well as short stories by A. Bitov and V. Fomenko. All of these are well-known names that need no introduction, and each of these writers has his own following.

Then we should mention the name of Ye. Kersnovskaya—although it means nothing to the reader for the present. I have no doubt that her book "Rocky Landscape," which the journal will publish in three issues, will prove to be one of the most significant works of journalism.

A certain condescending attitude has crept into the criticism of recent years in regard to the memoirs of persons who figured in past events, as if to say: Let us forgive them for the fact that even to this day they cannot see the forest for the trees and do not understand all that happened. And along with this condescension, there is the wise melancholy of a person who, seventy or even a hundred years earlier, could have foretold what and how events would occur; and therein lies the misfortune, that he was not consulted—hence the confusion that resulted in taking the wrong path. It is the same old story. In stormy times there are always those with 20/20 hindsight. To understand the times, however, manuscripts are particularly valuable in which the mysterious nature of the future is not tampered with, and the authors of which do not accommodate themselves to present-day viewpoints, and do not reconstruct events in such a way as to make themselves seem smarter and more perspicacious, but honestly describe how things were to the best of their understanding. Such manuscripts, free from tampering, we try to present for the judgment and consideration of our readers. And the

journal's mail confirms the fact that journalistic prose today is no less interesting to people than novels and shorter stories.

This section of ZNAMYA promises to be a big one towards the end of the year as well as next year. We are going to print the memoirs of N. S. Khrushchev. Here, importance lies not only in relating the most significant events—not only in the facts themselves—but in the personality of the author that emerges from this very sincere, at times artlessly ingenuous, account. Our serialization of D. T. Shepilov's "The Easy Way" will be concluded. We will publish Roy Medvedev's book entitled "Brezhnev" and V. Lakshin's book "New World: The Times of Khrushchev." The editorial backlog includes G. Kuznetsova's "Grasskiy Diary" and the notes of a Cheka operative, M. Shreyder. Each of these books records the times and fortunes of people who were once alive—and who now live on.

The section "From Our Literary Heritage" will be continued in the journal as in years past. We hope to offer stories by V. Tendryakov and G. Bell, work on the literature and contemporaries of G. Adamovich, literary portraits of B. Zaytsev, excerpts from the memoirs of Z. Gippius, and articles by G. Fedotov. A book by R. Gul, "Azef," stirred quite a furor in its time and then was forgotten. We think this novel will prove of interest not only as a historical novel; its subject matter provides a detective story constructed by life itself. Needless to say, these are by no means of all the works we propose to publish.

Social and political commentary will be represented by the work of O. Latsis, A. Levikov, G. Lisichkin, V. Selyunin, Yu. Chernichenko; a book by Ya. Golovanov entitled "Catastrophe" on the life of S. P. Korolev; a book by I. Arshveskiy entitled "Science and Morality" on the fate of academician A. A. Ukhtomskiy; "At Home and in America" by A. Strelyanyy and "Marginal Notes" by philosopher Ye. Starikov.

Next year, if not before the end of this year, the journal will carry poems by B. Akhmadulina, T. Bek, I. Brodskiy, Ye. Yevtushenko, A. Zhigulin, Vl. Kornilov, M. Kudimova, Yu. Kublanovskiy, Yu. Levitinskiy, I. Lisnianskaya, M. Matusovskiy, A. Mezhirov, B. Oleynika, O. Postnikov, D. Samoylov, T. Smertina, A. Tsvetkov, O. Chukontsev, and I. Shklyarevskiy.

In 1990 we shall launch a critical survey of the prose of the past year. It will be carried out by I. Zolotusskiy. This has become a tradition for the journal ZNAMYA. Articles or works of criticism have also been promised us by L. Anninskiy, A. Bocharov, I. Dedkov, V. Kardin, Yu. Karyakin, L. Lazarev, A. Lebedev, Vl. Ognev, St. Rassadin, Ye. Sergeyev, V. Sokolov, I. Solovyeva, Ye. Sterikova, V. Turbin, A. Turkov, I. Fonyakov, S. Chuprinin, and I. Shaytanov.

These are all our regular authors. However, a subject of special concern to the journal has been and continues to be young talented writers. We are pleased to provide them space in our pages.

DRUZHBA NARODOV Editor Baruzdin

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian
19 Jul 89 p 7

[Article by Sergey Baruzdin, editor in chief of the journal DRUZHBA NARODOV]

[Text] 1. Bearing in mind the specific nature of our journal, I think I should begin with what is stirring everybody up more than anything else—the strengthening of relations between nationalities. Prior to April 1985 we were not able to talk about this subject in any form. The censor would take out even the most innocuous material. Only now is there beginning to be a period of serious investigation. It was for this reason that two years ago a special department called "Peoples and Peace" was established in DRUZHBA NARODOV, materials of which appear in each issue. We have now decided to create at the journal a special advisory council on inter-nationality relations made up of well-known writers and scholars, ethnographers, jurists, and party workers—that is, people who, in one way or another, are involved in the tangle of problems that we have accumulated over the past decades.

Unfortunately, we have not managed to carry out everything that had been planned for the current year. Indeed, this is only natural. The creative process does not lend itself to rigid regimentation. We had promised, in particular, to print A. Rybakov's novel "1935 and Other Years," but the author did not succeed in finishing it and we were able to publish only the first part of the second book. We also announced publication of S. Antonov's "Five Kopecks." These will be transferred to next year's schedule. Last year in an interview with your newspaper I cautiously mentioned that R. Medvedev had promised us his book on L. I. Brezhnev. It will also be switched to the plan for 1990, as will A. Averchenko's short novel "The Patron's Last Joke."

2. In terms of achieving its purpose—I have in mind depicting the complexities of relations between nationalities—publication of S. Lipkin's novel "Ten Days" seems to me the most successful.

V. Kaverin's short novel "The Elder Brother" stirred considerable reader interest. I want to say a few good words also about present-day works dealing with the complexities of our period of perestroika. I will name one of them: Ye. Bogdanov's short novel "Group at Risk." Noteworthy publications appeared in the literary heritage section, including "The Mahogany Tree" by B. Pilnyak, "The Key" by M. Aldanov, "Chevengur" by A. Platanov, and "Story of a Medical Zone" by M. Khvylevyy. The latter was published in the Ukraine only after it had come out in Moscow. A similar situation regarding "blank spots" has come about in Central Asian literatures as well as in those of the Caucasus and Belorussia.

3. As for next year's plans, we are waiting to receive from A. Adamovich a very trenchant short novel about our

recent past, entitled "How I Became a Serf-Owner." S. Aleksuyevich is now finishing a confessional novel for us about those who went through the war in Afghanistan, entitled "The Galvanized Boys." We intend to publish G. Baklanov's novel "It Started Like This," D. Granin's novel "Story of a Little-Known Person," a short novel by Yu. Davidov called "Blue Tulips," and a documentary by B. Pankin about Konstantin Mikhaylovich Simonov. Last year we announced in advance publication of a novel by O. Trifonovoy-Miroshnichenko entitled "Attempted Farewell," but were unable to bring it into print. We have now decided to accompany the publication of a semi-documentary about Yuriy Valentinovich Trifonov with heretofore unpublished diaries of the writer himself. Readers of DRUZHBА NARODOV will be able to acquaint themselves with new works by Ch. Amirzdzhibi, A. Bitov, V. Voynovich, Ch. Guseynov, T. Pulatov, and A. Ebansidze. Among those who have promised to turn over their work to us are V. Kozko, V. Kondratyev, B. Okudzhava, V. Sangi, N. Eydelman, and A. Yakubov. Our editorial portfolio includes A. Solzhenitsyn's "August 1914" and his film story "They Know the Truth of the Tanks." Of course, the journal's format consists primarily of prose. This has always been the case. But today poetry finds itself completely in the shadow of prose and works of journalism. We should like nevertheless to recognize the poetic works of the Ukrainian D. Pavlychko, which in my judgment merit attention, together with the Moldavian V. Grossu, the Uzbek U. Azimov, the Belorussian T. Bondar, the Georgian Sh. Nishikanidze, the Lithuanian A. Gribayskasa, and B. Ukachin of the Altay Mountains region.

We shall continue to fill in the "blank spots." Next year we want to publish a manuscript by academician V. I. Verdanskiy entitled "Preserving Ukrainians," a diary by G. Ivanov, and poems by O. Batsiyetisa. We will acquaint our readers as well as we can with eyewitness accounts of the tragic events of our history. There are several, but I will name only "Notes of a Survivor" by S. Golitsyn, a descendent of the ancient family of princes.

We will continue to publish speeches by spokesmen for the Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Islamic religions.

We will introduce a new rubric, called for the time being "People's Deputy Rostrum." Among the materials for this section we intend to print articles reflecting a variety of problems of Soviet power from top to bottom. As you know, while we talk loudly and long about the need to revive the slogan "All power to the soviets," the soviets, meanwhile, remain virtually without rights. The new rubric is meant to address these vital problems of our time.

As in the past, the number one theme of the journal, as stated on the cover, is the friendship of peoples, and the "sore spots" in the problems of relations between nationalities. Striving for more comprehensive and in-depth coverage, we have decided to familiarize our readers

with such significant works as N. Berdyayev's "Christianity and Anti-Semitism," G. Fedotov's "On National Penitence," and St. Lem's "Provocation."

Materials under the rubric "Reprints of Note" has as its aim restoring if only to a certain extent the picture of the development of national literatures during the Soviet period. Already in print are early articles by I. Dzyuba on Ukrainian literature of the 1930's and by L. Aninskiy on the letters of Korlenko, Gorkiy, and Pavlov, which were published not long ago in our periodical. Similar works covering various regions of the country are now in preparation.

OKTYABR Editor Ananyev

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian
19 July 89 p 7

[Article by Anatoliy Ananyev, editor in chief of the journal OKTYABR]

[Text] I. In response to the first question, I want to make the following point. We do not work with ready-made materials but with living people; that is, with authors, who cannot always manage to complete their plans within prescribed periods, as might be supposed. Sometimes there is "opposition" to the manuscripts submitted and the work on it is delayed. In such cases, although we have an interest in the timely receipt of a novel or narrative of some sort. Nevertheless, we try to share the concerns of the author and help him as much as we can. For this reason we do not always succeed in carrying out our plans. If our plans were made solely on the basis of manuscripts that were ready for publication, then we would be forced to delay publication of works written on the most timely topics, demanding immediate public exposure.

So it was in the case of D. Volkogonov's chronicle "Triumph and Tragedy," which we published after a certain amount of delay, and which was even in danger of being switched to next year; and also in the case of I. Volgin's book "To Be Born in Russia." M. Ganinaya's novel "Kingfisher—Blue Bird, scheduled for publication back in 1988, will be announced in 1990, as will the memoirs of N. Mordukova.

However, the work that we particularly wanted to present this year we have already succeeded in having printed. This includes the above-mentioned book by I. Volgin; stories by I. Kireyev under the title "Banquet for One"; Sasha Solokov's "School for Imbeciles"; A. Aleksin's "Plaything"; and V. Maksheyev's "And Then to Dream."

All the same, we very much regret that we were obliged to refrain from publishing V. Nabokov's "The Exploit" and "Despair" since we were preempted by the journals RADUGA and VOLGA. This is not surprising inasmuch, in the first place, as we lack direct communications with other editorial staffs, particularly the peripheral ones, and to coordinate our output with theirs would

scarcely be expedient since the journals might lose their individual identity. Secondly, we cannot be unmindful of the good, healthy competition that today has developed between our publications.

We have received quite a number of letters from readers asking why OKTYABR did not publish "The Dress Rehearsal" by A. Galich. This happened primarily because of a lack of coordinated effort by the publishers. The author's own story about a dress rehearsal of the play "The Silence of Seamen," which is of special interest, together with the text of the play, was published successfully in another journal. We offer our readers an apology, although we were not at fault.

It goes without saying that in the future we shall continue to do everything in our power to have our published articles conform to plans. It seems to me, however, that it is necessary to have faith in the editors. Then readers will be relieved of a part of the unexplained questions that naturally disturb them. We shall strive to offer as many interesting and important articles as we can, covering as many as possible of the most sensitive issues of the day—moral as well as social and economic. However formidable this task may be, the editorial staff is fully resolved to fulfill it.

2. The most successful published work (although the epithet "successful" is not altogether suitable) is undoubtedly V. Grossman's short novel "All Things Pass Away." It stands out from the others in terms of its artistic and intellectual content as well as in the unusually complex means it employs to communicate its message to the reader.

3. The plan for next year is an ambitious one. It is not possible to enumerate all the works we plan to publish, so I will name only the principal ones. The journal will continue to publish I. Volgin's book on Dostoyevskiy. D. Volkogonov is scheduled to offer for publication his new manuscript entitled "Lev Trotsky: A Political Portrait." I have already spoken of the memoirs of N. Mordyukova. In addition, we intend to publish chapters from A. Danikin's five-volume work "Sketches From Russia's Time of Troubles." We regard these works as journalistic prose in many respects traditional for OKTYABR. With respect to literary work, here, in my view, are our special discoveries. In the first place, the novel "Heritage" by V. Kormer, an author unknown to us up to this time, who unfortunately died fairly recently. His novel reveals the origin of the dissident mood of the 1950's and 1960's and, along with it, narrates the fate of people who had been forced to leave their country in the 1920's. The theme of Russian exile is not a new one either in general or in our contemporary literature. But the novel is of interest in that it opens up to us aspects of heretofore hidden and in many respects broken lives, and reveals the complex interweaving of the destinies of two different generations.

I want to mention one more name—that of I. Polyak, author of "Camp Songs of Bedraggled Orphans." This is

the touching confession of a teen-ager left without parents in a camp for orphans ruled by prison ethics.

The reader may extend his acquaintanceship with S. Dovlatov, a compatriot of ours in the United States. We are publishing his insightful short novel "The Foreigner," commemorating a single Russian woman who found herself living abroad.

Our journal has always offered its pages to young writers. Beginning one's career in OKTYABR, of course, cannot guarantee a cloudless future in publishing. Now as before, young people find publishing opportunities with difficulty. The editorial staff therefore decided to provide an opportunity once again to recall those talented authors who first broke into print with us. Among those that have submitted stories to the editors are B. Abrosimov, D. Vakhin, V. Bushnyak, A. Bychkov, A. Vorontsov, D. Dobrodeyev, D. Dragunskiy, L. Kostyukov, and M. Popov.

In the section "From Our Literary Heritage" the staff proposes to publish diaries, letters, memoirs, and unpublished works by A. Belyy, M. Bulgakov, S. Volkonskiy, B. Zaytsev, V. Korolenko, B. Pasternak, A. Remizov, V. S. Solovyev, V. Khodasevich, and M. Tsvetayeva.

Poetry in OKTYABR next year will be represented by the verse of B. Akhmadulina, K. Banshenkin, P. Begin, Ye. Vinokurov, G. Gorbovskiy, I. Kashezheva, Yu. Morits, D. Samoylov, V. Tsybin, as well as other young and well-known poets.

In addition, the editors intend to introduce new rubrics: "People's Commentary" and "Dialogue With Our Countrymen Abroad."

"People's Commentary" is not simply a new rubric expressive of a desire of the editors to diversify material—it expresses a demand of the times. We encounter today a completely new phenomenon as the voice of the people—their insight, conscience, and state of awareness—has become essential to the political life of the country. For precisely this reason the editors have decided to open up the pages of the journal extensively to authors from among the people. There is yet another consideration that prompts the introduction of this rubric. These letters that currently come to the editors in a great wave bear witness to the fact that, in addition to the language of the newspapers and the language of literature, there is yet another vivid, aphoristic language of the people themselves. Although it has undergone changes since the start of the century, as it has been sifted through the lives of the people, our language has become enriched. We believe that publishing articles in the form of letters from authors representing the people will introduce an element of pungent present-day speech into the language of literature.

Editors of MOSKVA, NEVA Provide Publishing Plans

18001438 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Jul 89 p 7

[Responses by Mikhail Alekseyev, chief editor of the journal MOSKVA, and Boris Nikolskiy, chief editor of the journal NEVA, to a LITERATURNAYA GAZETA questionnaire: "And What About You?"]

[Text] At the readers' request, we continue publishing the responses by chief editors of the USSR Writers Union's "pithy" creative literature journals and the RSFSR Writers Union's most influential journals to our Literary Life Department's questionnaire:

1. Did you succeed in doing everything planned?
2. In your opinion, which published work was the most successful?
3. What do you plan to publish in 1990?

Mikhail Alekseyev, chief editor of the journal MOSKVA

1. Before talking about what we did not succeed in doing in 1989, I should like to note that we are keeping the word given to our readers, and have been publishing the complete text of N.M. Karamzin's "The History of the Russian State," from issue to issue, for 2 years (1988-1989). We continue to receive reader thank-you letters for this, even to the present day.

I take this opportunity, in turn, to thank our readers for this constant support of the editorial office collective. In issue No 12, we shall finish publishing "The History's" final, 12th volume, and now we are thinking about the steps we intend to take at the end of this year in connection with completing this huge work.

Professor A. Smirnov's very meaningful articles, replete with interesting historical facts, which we have unified by using the common rubric "How 'The History of the Russian State' Came about," are accompanying publication of "The History of the Russian State." The third article will be published in issue No 8, and we plan to publish several more of this author's articles.

Unfortunately, we shall not succeed in doing everything planned for 1989. Unlike a publishing house, a creative literature journal, required to reflect the current literary process, is compelled to correct its plans frequently. And this is as it should be.

The journal's closing numbers are now being readied to turn over to the printing office. We shall try to include everything we have announced for 1989, insofar as possible, in these remaining issues.

2. Naturally, I can talk about this year's most successful published works only on the basis of the six issues of the journal which have reached the subscribers, and on which we have a so-called "feedback."

Judging by the readers' letters, the following aroused the greatest interest among published works of the current year, 1989. In prose: V. Soloukhin's story "Laughter Over My Left Shoulder" (issue No 1), N. Gumilev's "Recollections of a Cavalryman" (issue No 2), A. Prokhanov's two narratives revealing the truth about the war in Afghanistan (issue No 2), V. Petelin's documentary narrative "The Rise" (Part II), about the young Shalyapin (issues Nos 3-5), and the introductory chapters of a new novel by the patriarch of Russian literature and remarkable master of words L. Leonov (issue No 5).

Publication of N. Gorbachev's new novel "The Mortals" (issues Nos 5-9) and G. Pryakhin's published story "Somewhere an Oriole is Weeping" (issues Nos 10, 11) will be finished before the year's end, and St. Rybas' big novel "The Ashes" will be started.

In poetry: the poems "The Duel" by N. Palkin, dedicated to N.G. Chernyshevskiy (issue No 1), and "The Orphanage" by Ye. Yerkhov (issue No 1); new translations of T.G. Shevchenko's poems, done by the young poet Yu. Petrov (issue No 3), and collections of poems by F. Sukhov, St. Zolottsev, and others.

The current affairs articles and essays "Thrice Condemned" by Ye. Losev, dedicated to Second Army Commander Filipp Kuzmich Mironov (issue No 2), "Time To Clean House" by M. Antonov (issue No 3), "Not Admission, But Prevention" by V. Khatyushin (issue No 4), "In the State's Labors" by Yu. Loshchits (issue No 5), and "The Nationality Problem in Russia" by A. Lanshchikov (issue No 6) elicited lively debates and varying responses by the readers.

In criticism: the articles "Nabokov and Gogol" by Yu. Barabash (issue No 1), "We Have One Homeland" by A. Gulyga (issue No 2), "Bunin's 'Outcast Days'" by O. Mikhaylov (issue No 3), "What Did Gogol Believe In?" by V. Astafyev (issue No 4), and "Seventy Years of Battle" by V. Lichutin, devoted to analysis of A. Prokhanov's novel "Six Hundred Years After the Battle" (issue No 4).

In the "Art" section: artist M. Ks. Sokolov's letters "To Whom [illegible word here] My Sorrow..." (issue No 2); M. Rakhmanova's "I Perceive the People As One Great Person," devoted to M.P. Musorgskiy (issue No 3); Yu. Dyakonov's "I Fly Where I Wish," a polemical article on modern cinematic art's problems (issue No 5); L. Mikhaylova's "The Unpredictability of the Famous," about the artist V.A. Milashevskiy's creativity (issue No 6).

3. In 1990, we intend to bring to the readers' attention: the Moscow prosers' novels "The Poor Slob" by A. Afanasyev, about the moral responsibility each of us has for the soullessness that has become obvious in the society (a sort of sequel to the widely read novel "The Last Soldier"), and "Corvus Corone [The Carrion Crow]" by Nikolay Vereshagin, in which, in satiric form, with fantasy interspersions, the author investigates contemporary Moscow, the continuing destruction of its

monuments of antiquity, the complication of its social relations, and the exacerbation of its ecological problems.

F. Mikulish's novel "The Hominids: One Young Idealist's Life and Its Happenings," about a hero who forgot how to idolize.

A Prokhanov's novel "The Angel Missed the Mark," a provocative narrative about a hero worried by the dominance of technocratic tendencies in the life of both our country and the whole planet.

The stories "Class Sessions and Teachers" by Val. Sidorov, about the spiritual life of Russia and India, and what may be called the unrecognized phenomena of the cosmos and the human psyche, and V. Soloukhin's "Laughter Over My Left Shoulder" (Book 2).

Continuing our journal's tradition of maintaining Russian and Indian philosophy's line of communication, we propose to print Nikolay Rerikh's work "Shining Shambala," unpublished here in our country, devoted to a legendary, hidden Himalayan country, and the first book in the Living Ethics series "The Leaves of (Móriya) Garden" (Volume I, "The Call," and Volume II, "The Dawning").

During the year, the editorial office plans the publishing of M.I. Pylyayev's "Old Moscow," which has not been republished in about 100 years. Unfortunately, the same fate also overtook Pylyayev's other unique works, "Old St. Petersburg," "The Old Life," and "Remarkable Eccentrics and Originals."

Interesting publications are planned next year in current affairs, and in the criticism and art sections.

Boris Nikolskiy, chief editor of the journal NEVA

1. I can say with complete confidence that we have either already kept our promises to the readers, or will keep them—several journal issues still lie ahead. We finished publishing the Strugatskiy Brothers' fantasy novel "The Doomed City," printed the first book of L. Chukovskaya's "Notes on Anna Akhmatova," published Ya. Gordin's narrative in documents and memoirs "The Brodskiy Affair," have just offered the readers A. Zlobin's satiric novel "The Dismantling," and the journal's eighth issue is already in production with V. Kaverin's "memoir novel," "Epilogue," presented, hard as this may be to accept, in posthumous publication.... I name the works that aroused the greatest reader interest, judging by the editorial office mail.

In giving an interview last year, I also promised the readers some surprises. The appearance of Robert Conquest's renowned book "The Great Terror" on NEVA's pages will be such a "surprise." It, in our opinion, is the fullest and deepest public-affairs investigation of the tragic aspects of our society's history. R. Conquest was NEVA's guest recently, and the editorial office will precede his book, which we shall begin publishing in

issue No 9, by a conversation with the writer himself. R. Conquest's work will be published in several issues, and its publication will be completed as early as next year.

2. What current-year publication was the most successful? This is a difficult question, and the more so because the year has not yet ended. Indeed, each December the editorial staff awards special NEVA prizes for the works recognized as best. Thus I should not like to anticipate the editorial staff's decision. I can say only one thing: If one judges by reader responses, then S. Andreyev's article "The Power Structure and Society's Problems" (NEVA issue No 1, 1989) literally caused an explosion of interest and a storm of emotions. The desire to immediately express their attitude toward the article and state their opinion was so great that many of our subscribers resorted to the telegraph services. The editorial office had known of nothing like it before. Moreover, an overwhelming majority of the telegrams, telephone calls, articles, and letters—and there were hundreds of them—warmly supported the published work. One may, of course, have various attitudes toward the individual propositions stated by S. Andreyev, and one may take issue with the author, but the fact that his article touched upon something very important to many, many people raises no doubts. We initiated a new rubric in the journal with S. Andreyev's work—"The 'Alternative' Political Club"—and this rubric has now become one of the most popular among our readers. The flood of manuscripts, suggestions, and letters addressed to him is not subsiding. We shall publish the most interesting of these. We have every reason to hope that our current affairs writers' political fervor, not only will not diminish next year, but, on the contrary, will increase.

One of the main questions that has constantly bothered me, both as chief editor and as USSR People's Deputy, and which hardly a single meeting has managed to avoid, has been this: "Will 'Neva' publish Solzhenitsyn?" And I have been answering: "Yes, we intend to do this. We are making efforts, so to speak." Now I can state most definitely: Next year we shall commence by publishing A. Solzhenitsyn's narrative "The Seventeenth of March" from the series "The Red Wheel." Why have we settled on just this book? Well, firstly, it was the recommendation of the author himself—the writer feels that this work is very "Petrograd," and for this reason will be of special interest to precisely our journal. And this is indeed so. Secondly, A. Solzhenitsyn's narrative, constructed, first of all, on a documentary basis, distinguished by extraordinary extensiveness of fact description and depth of research, and, most importantly—written by a true artist's hand—will have particular significance due, in our opinion, to the tremendous interest in the history of the country, in the history of the Revolution, in the history's ostensible and secret motive forces, and in the realized and unrealized potentials that now exist in our society. It is the kind of history that is timely even today.

Next year, we also intend to acquaint our readers with other important works of our fellow countrymen living

abroad. A number of such proposals are now being reviewed by the editorial staff.

I am certain that the new works of those authors especially favored—I shall not conceal it—by “Neva,” whose previous publications on the journal’s pages became notable events, and gained extensive popularity, will also attract our subscribers’ attention. I have V. Dudintsev and L. Chukovskaya in mind. “Between Two Novels”—thus did V. Dudintsev name his new work. The years of the writer’s life which went by, from creation of the novel “Not by Bread Alone,” to the appearance on NEVA’s pages of “White Dresses,” turned out to be so filled with both dramatic twists of fate and amusing everyday occurrences that they became a sort of novel by themselves.

Such of the journal’s regular authors as D. Granin, B. Vasilyev, V. Konetskiy, Yu. Rytkeu, A. and B. Strugatskiy, Ya. Gordin, Yu. Slepukhin, and P. Pogodin have also promised us their collaboration next year.

It is more difficult, of course, with current prose devoted to the present day. The situation’s difficulty is in our being unable and unwilling to return to former times, when, for the sake of a so-called current subject, we were willing to forgive one work or another its artistic inarticulacy. At the same time, the demand is great for current prose that talks to the reader about the present day’s vital issues. And we are trying to pick out for publication only those works that are outstanding, not only in meaningfulness of vital material, but also in openness, sincerity, and freshness of view. Such, in our opinion, are the stories of the Leningrad prosers G. Nikolayev, “The Warehouse”, V. Surov, “The Waiting Room”, and A. Drabkina; the Muscovite V. Kantor’s story “The Crocodile,” and A. Zhitinskiy’s artistic current affairs work “The Musical Novel.” We shall also acquaint our reader with entirely new names.

Of course, I certainly shall not manage to tell you everything in a brief interview, but still, I cannot fail to mention an interesting forthcoming publication—Fedor Abramov’s correspondence with one of his Vyatka [presently Kirov] correspondents. The correspondence was carried on for many years, and is, I am convinced, of considerable interest to all who love and treasure F. Abramov’s creativity.

Film Director Ryazanov to Produce ‘Chonkin’

18001405a SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian
1 Jul 89 p 2

[Interview with director Eldar Aleksandrovich Ryazanov by E. Kekelidze: “Where are the Limits of the Limits?]

[Text] Today every creative meeting turns into an evening of questions and answers—so great is the need for discussion, for dialogue, for frankness.

Eldar Ryazanov’s creative evenings are no exception. The most diverse questions were asked by the audience,

and frank answers to them were received. Our correspondent also asked his own questions for the newspaper.

[Kekelidze] Eldar Aleksandrovich, when restructuring started, many humorists and satirists began to complain of difficulties in work: everything most interesting and previously forbidden, they say, gets into the newspapers now, and the party is taking away the bitter bread of exposure. In the course of time, evidently, their alarm should have subsided. In your opinion, are there signs that the satire of the era of stagnation has flowed smoothly over into the satire of the era of glasnost?

[Ryazanov] The party talks about shortcomings without a sense of humor. It is cardinally distinct from satirists in this regard. In general, however, of course, it has become considerably more difficult for satirists to work. Previously, boldness in satire was valued. Really, restructuring did take away this function. Today, it is not worthwhile for a satirist to be daring: this is a given. Now, one rarely succeeds in being more daring than our leader or certain speeches at the Congress. Although there is a great deal of material, which should be laughed at and mocked. It seems to me, the difficulty with this is that satire should rise up threateningly against the most cardinal issues in our life, not even against the economy: it has also been officially subjected to utter defeat. Here, frameworks enter come into the question. As everyone knows, we all should work “within a framework,” particularly within the framework of socialism. Glasnost within the framework of socialism, satire within the framework of socialism... It seems to me that there should be no frameworks whatsoever, that is all.

There are millions of shortcomings in our life. Quality of work is required of satirists, in order for the work to be funny. This is not at all the same as being daring.

[Kekelidze] However, as before, satire on the screen (and in literature), alas, is rare. Your “Forgotten Tune for the Flute” has been called the first satire of the time of restructuring. Do you see anyone following you?

[Ryazanov] Only “Fountain.”

[Kekelidze] Oh, yes.

[Ryazanov] My student, Yuriy Mamin, produced the picture. This pleases me greatly. The building in this film personifies our country... Nothing more, perhaps, needs to be said.

[Kekelidze] It is interesting that there are almost no comedic directors in our movie industry. Even simple, undemanding comedies—these are also rare.

[Ryazanov] Yes, you know, for several years I worked to teach students in the higher directing classes, and now almost all of them have gone into movies, but not all of them are doing comedy. Ivan Dykhovichnyy produced Chekhov’s “Black Monk.” Yevgeniy Tsimbal did the picture “Defender Sedov,” about the year 1937. Isaak Fridberg produced the strong picture “Little Dolls.” And Mamin did a comedy. Vagif Mustafayev produced

"Scoundrels," a comedy. And Mikhail Solodukhin adapted a story by Zoshchenko for the screen, done in two time periods—the action occurs in Zoshchenko's time and in our own. The picture is called "Down With Commerce on the Love Front." One and the same subject, one and the same story.

Some more comedies... Ovcharov at Lenfilm is working on a subject, closely related to popular literature... I cannot think, perhaps, of anyone else.

[Kekelidze] And your prognoses? Are comedic directors appearing in our country, which so loves to laugh?

[Ryazanov] We have always had a scarcity of them. The Russian national nature is quite different from the Gallic, we did not have our own Rabelais, Francois Villon, Claude Tillet... Our comedigraphs have always had a mix of bitterness, if we recall Gogol or Saltykov-Shchedrin... In this sense, we do not have a rich tradition... We love to laugh, but we do not know how, perhaps? Although... Right now, I am making a picture here...

[Kekelidze] "Chonkin?"

[Ryazanov] Yes, "The Life and Adventures of Private Ivan Chonkin." Such an enormous number of people think that I will be working on blasphemy, that there are things that must not be laughed at. I think that there is nothing that should not be laughed at. Protest against this tale is the consequence of the cult of personality and the dogmatic perception of art as an aid to life. Yet art, like science, should not be an aid to life. Indeed, I am encountering resistance, but I am ready for it.

[Kekelidze] Do you already know the actors?

[Ryazanov] More or less.

[Kekelidze] And the main heroes are?

[Ryazanov] Vladimir Steklov, he has a naturalness, a certain genuine peasant nature, and he is a remarkable actor. And Nataliya Gundareva.

[Kekelidze] I wish you success. We are waiting for a meeting with "Chonkin."

Expenditures of Contributions to Soviet Culture Fund Given

18001405b Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in
Russian No 29, 22-28 Jul 89 p 8

[Comments by G. Myasnikov, first deputy chairman of the board, Soviet Culture Fund, with an editorial comment by I. Shamshina: "Last Week in the Editorial Mail"]

[Text] *For what purposes are the funds donated to the Soviet Culture Fund spent?*

A. Kovalenko, Angarsk

We asked G. Myasnikov, first deputy chairman of the board of the Soviet Culture Fund, to answer this question:

In 1988, the Soviet Culture Fund's income was 16,386,000 rubles. Of this, 8,642,000 rubles, or more than 50 percent, were the people's donations.

From charitable activity and holding exhibits and auctions, 1,464,000 rubles were received in 1988.

Income from the implementation of polygraphic production comprised 1,207,000 rubles.

The Soviet Culture Fund magazine, NASHE NASLEDIYE, provided 0.4 million rubles in profits.

Receipts from production activity, in the form of deductions from the profits of cost-accounting enterprises and cooperatives, amounted to 680,000 rubles.

From constituents, 3,975,000 rubles were received.

The Soviet Culture Fund's hard currency fund amounted to 136,000 rubles in hard currency on 1 January 1989.

There are 110 people on the board of the Soviet Culture Fund, according to the staff list. For the maintenance of the apparatus in the center and in local areas (salaries, business trips, acquisition of property, repair), 3,547,000 rubles were spent.

From constituent funds, the following purposeful expenditures were also made (in thousand rubles): deductions for eliminating calamitous consequences and restoring the cultural objects of Armenia—500; the maintenance of the joint Soviet Culture Fund and Soros "Cultural Initiative" committee—249; and for holding the 1st International Folklore Festival in Moscow and the Slavic Literature Holiday in Novgorod—100.

Out of funds received as a gift, 500,000 rubles were spent by the Soviet Culture Fund board on the partial financing of the following actions (in thousand rubles): restoration of A.K. Tolstoy's country estate—100; restoration of a branch of the "B. Krinita" Rublev Museum—200; restoration of Shalyapin's home in Moscow; and for publication of the Radzivillov Chronicle—110.

From the Editors: Unquestionably, all items of expenditure by the Soviet Culture Fund were necessary for the development of culture. However, a certain element of disproportion is surprising. Thus, office and administrative expenses amounted to 609,000 rubles, while only 15,000 rubles were spent on scientific research work and stipends.

Reporter Describes Activities of Democratic Union

18001410 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 27 Jul 89 pp 17-18

[Article by A.Nikolayev: "Bluff"]

[Text] Esteemed Editors:

It was mentioned at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies that some associations of individuals styling themselves as parties entice the population to take part in rallies and openly call for strikes; it was also stated that their aim is not to bring the society closer together but to intensify political tensions. It would seem that the worse it is for the country, the better it is for them. A Democratic Union [DU] was mentioned several times in this context. You have already published an article about that organization, titled "Behind Gogol's Back" (EG, No.26, 1988). Would you please come back to the subject you raised a year ago? One would like to know, for instance, what has become of the DU, what kind of people they are, whether or not they have an economic program and what it is they are trying to achieve.

Believe me, this is not idle curiosity. I think that many of your readers would support my request.

E.Pomerantsev, Welder, City of Gorkiy

Late at night, several people entered an apartment house situated near the RSFSR Council of Ministers Building. Having glanced at their watches, they hurriedly ascended to the fourth floor. They rang the doorbell and the owner of the apartment welcomed his guests and myself, the EG correspondent, to the meeting of the founding committee of the so-called Democratic Party of the Soviet Union (DPSU). The DPSU was formed after a schism split the DU. Among those present at the meeting were former members of the DU which had made such a splash with its rallies. In this way I renewed my acquaintance with former and current members of the DU, the subject of this article. I wrote this article in order to put to rest all rumor and conjecture and to state plainly what it is that this union, acting in the name and in the guise of perestroika, is enticing us to do.

"Do You Understand Russian?"

A year ago, when I was working on an article about an unsanctioned DU rally in Moscow, at the Gogol monument, I could not foresee that I would be getting occasional phone calls from L.Ubozhko, who was at the time a member of the DU's coordinating committee and currently is the chairman of the DPSU. He would at first inquire after my health, later question me about my circle of acquaintances and later still float the possibility of writing an article about the DU.

Ubozhko's stories about his successes in organizing a series of rallies in Moscow, Sverdlovsk Oblast and other regions of the country soon gave way to complaints that the situation at the DU was from bad to worse and that a split, if not a total collapse of the DU, was imminent.

Then came the unexpected telephone invitation.

"So, you are split, are you not?" I blurted.

"We are. But best talent from the DU is with us, at the DPSU. Will you come?"

"Certainly."

As it transpired, I was the only one of Soviet journalists and foreign correspondents stationed in Moscow to have received such an invitation: I was apparently "the most skilled at putting the exact words of the speakers between quotation marks." I would not want to make any comments on this subject, but I think that most of my colleagues can do it just as well. The problem in my opinion is that it is difficult to question DU members not only for passersby who chance to witness their unsanctioned rallies, but for journalists as well. Why? Because the organizers of such rallies usually give advance notice of them almost exclusively to foreign correspondents. Speeches and interviews are reserved for them. And to avoid mistakes, they double-check beforehand: "Do you understand Russian? You are a foreign correspondent, are you not?"

This may be the reason why our newspapers still usually print mostly news reports about the DU, which tend to follow the same format: they state that an attempt to stage an anti-socialist rally was made but the police prevented that provocation. Such reports, in my opinion, do little but create added excitement around the DU. Some people read a report that a provocation is in the works and rush to the scene the following day, hoping that it was a dress rehearsal and that they would now see the premier. But it is the DU's aims that are interesting, especially since rumors spread by samizdat leaflets and the DU's own weekly publication SVOBODNOYE SLOVO would make one believe that the members of that organization are engaged in a struggle almost on a daily basis. One wonders what it is they fight for.

Attention: Recruitment

What did happen at that safe house whose address the former DU members utter in a hushed voice?

At the stroke of nine everyone gathered in a small, decently furnished room. In addition to the members of the founding committee of the DPSU, an ordinary member of the party sat on the edge of the sofa. He was a young history teacher who would later be raised to the founding committee due to his exemplary service. But for the time being no one paid him any attention since they were concerned with a more pressing matter, namely the results of a recent trip by two DPSU couriers to the Ukraine and the Baltic republics—all the more so since the trip was financed by the party—where they sounded the mood of local aficionados of various rallies or, to be exact, engaged in propaganda and recruitment activities.

What follows is a summary of their report which I took down during the meeting:

"I had the most difficult time in Kiev, where I called on every address I was given. First of all, you had placed the highest hopes on S.S., a young lawyer, and instructed me accordingly. Let me tell you that he is now a leader of the social-democratic movement and has allied himself with Leningrad. He now heads social democrats in Kiev. I met with him but the meeting was fruitless.

"As to A.A., (I changed the initials of those whom the couriers tried to recruit for the obvious reason that anyone could have been in their place) and her husband, they did not even want to talk about setting up a Union-wide organization. Her husband declared that the mere fact of our association with Moscow (meaning the the DPSU's geographical base) tarnishes us.

"As to V.V., he alone among Kiev leaders known to us remains devoted to our Moscow DU. I spent half a day with him. I showed him all the articles attacking the DU. I also showed him the open letters of those who left the DU. He took it all in, but then tried to back out claiming that he was a pure theoretician. But I told him that we need theoreticians as well and that we were actually counting on him in this respect. In the end we agreed that he would come in Moscow in about 10 days and would go to the DU to see for himself whether the situation there is just as I described. He would then draw his own conclusions and may even join us. So expect him.

"Only at the end of the second day did I go to G.G., whom I saved for the end in order to boost my spirits. G.G. represents the People's Front and I have always been lucky with the People's Fronts wherever I go. I was right this time, as well. As soon as I began he said: 'I will tell you what goes on in Kiev.' And he described to me the situation which I already knew. At last he said: 'We feel stifled in this People's Front of ours. If only there were something Union-wide, we would gladly lend our support to it.' I replied: 'This is why I am here.' and handed him our two-page manifesto. He read it and started to shake my hand. I said then: 'Sit down and write an application.' (Laughter in the audience and comments: 'Good boy! That's the way. Take the bull by the horns.')

"We concluded the deal in a little park by the metro station. He promised to send money for the folder of papers which I had given him; he would send money for the party card as well. Thus I felt that my mission was accomplished and after two days in Kiev I traveled overnight to Dnepropetrovsk. There, of course, I went to D.D. He is an old labor camp veteran and suffered a great deal for his dissident convictions, but he has become quite bourgeois now. He has a private car and a town house so large you would need a full day just to walk from one end of it to the other. He has recently returned from a trip to Hungary and his house is all furnished with imports. He did not give his consent to anything. As long as it was talk, we were in full agreement, but once I mentioned concrete actions he immediately backed off. I let him alone.

"In Vilnius, acting on my instructions, I got in touch with representatives of Lithuania's Democratic Party. I left them a folder of information about us and concluded a preliminary agreement on getting our future newspaper printed. They are willing to take on the job but on one condition: there is a 1,000 copy minimum on each order since they will typeset it. Very reasonable, too, at 3 kopeks per sheet. We could supply a copy to everyone who wants it!"

Discussion for Print

I could go on with my summary. However, I would like to break it off at this point for the following reason. Members of the DPSU and the DU pursue the same goal: while claiming that "no one party (including the CPSU) can be a leading and directing force in society" they nonetheless want to be officially recognized as parties capable of ruling the country. To achieve this goal they try to create public support for the idea of recognizing "citizens' and organizations' right to agitate against the existing political system" and demand "the immediate dissolution of the KGB, publishing the list of its employees," and unilateral cuts in conventional arms. The difference between the DPSU and the DU is in the methods they use in their struggle for power, which reflect the respective size of these organizations. The DPSU, whose core is comprised of former DU, is a small group and consequently its members do not even dare gather and rally passersby on streets and squares. (They do not want to set themselves up as everyone's laughing-stock, as a party with barely two dozen members.) The DU, on the other hand, has according to its leaders some 500 members across the country. As a result, DU members, besides conducting propaganda among the population and disseminating information in the form of appeals, leaflets and open letters, call for the active use of such methods as "demonstrations, rallies, strikes and participation in civil disobedience campaigns". They, of all people, have gained widespread notoriety in Moscow. It would suffice to mention their April 23 gathering at the Pushkin monument that culminated in a march to the Old Arbat. You may recall the roaring mob shouting and chanting "Freedom! Democracy!" It was the DU. On that Sunday, even such calls as "Revolution!" and "Kill Communists!" could be heard. That day DU all but goose-stepped before the eyes of astonished passersby. You should have seen that militant brotherhood halting traffic along the way (they marched on the street as well). You should have seen Arbat artists picking up their easels and brushes and scattering in all directions, vendors removing their wares off outdoor stands and taking cover in their stores and those who came for a stroll along the Arbat cleaving to building walls in fear.

"Did you see how many of us there were?" bragged the rally's participants after the event. "So there. We will show you yet!"

Where do this militancy and aggressiveness come from? They did not exist before. I recall the DU's early rallies. The party's most notable feature at the time was that its

founders claimed that it was "the party in which real democracy prevails" and that within the DU no one tried to grab power, all questions were decided jointly and in general no hierarchical obeisances were tolerated. They did not even use patronymics. In other words, they were one happy family where concord and understanding ruled. As to its program and statutes, outsiders were allowed to see those documents usually only from a safe distance. "Why would you want to read them? Trust us. Do you not believe us?" asked miffed DU members and promised that once they were recognized as the ruling party in the country (!), they would give us all a raise, provide consumer goods and free men from compulsory military service.

What has changed in a year? Rallies still go on, at the same monuments. But DU leaders no longer want to talk of democracy in their ranks, even though they have great tales to tell. The one, for instance, about the letter written to the DU by a former active member, A. Vercheni. The letter is kept at the union's organizational section under lock and key. Apparently the leadership does not dare to show it to ordinary DU. It is wrong. The organization's rank and file may wish to know what is going on at their union.

"Please do not consider me a member of the DU any longer, since membership in this party only leads to degradation, disintegration and loss of credibility," states the letter. *"The actual cause of my decision is the situation that exists in the party, the party that is nothing but a mirage, since there is no alliance of democratic forces on a multiparty basis there. A mafia clique that has usurped power in the party has created a climate of sycophancy and anathemizing of independent opinion... Currently, the central coordinating council of the DU is headed by persons... who do everything possible to discredit the idea of the multiparty system. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of party members perceive the danger inherent in the present situation and in the role of its leaders who want to be worshipped. The self-styled new messiahs I. Tsarkov and V. Novodvorskaya are such persons. These individuals have transgressed all norms of common Christian morality and disdain no method, however base, including cheating on elections to the Central Council, wholesale accusations based on personal likes and dislikes, intrigues, quarrels, lies, libel, financial irregularities, general suspicion and pervasive demagoguery in which Novodvorskaya has distinguished herself due to her ability to talk smoothly and skill in deceiving generally ignorant young people: she adroitly dresses up facts related to the period between 1917 and the present, including those which describe the situation in the ranks of the communist party..."*

There was also an open letter to the DU signed by six former members, which states:

"Those who fought their way into the leadership lack the moral right not only to lead but even to utter such words as democracy, freedom, pluralism or rule of law. Other terms should be more familiar to them, such as fraud, lies,

libel, intrigue, demagoguery, hunger for power, unprincipled behavior, betrayal of trust and flouting of democratic principles. Democracy and talk of rule of law have turned out to be nothing but a bubble in the hands of these novel builders of new, progressive society. These leaders have led the DU to its demise."

How the Program Was "Cooked" Up

It seems that the DU's crisis began much earlier. Primarily it was due to the bankruptcy of its program. In fact, the DU's members never had any serious economic platform. Those who put it together told me themselves that the work on the program consisted basically of throwing together catchphrases from the press and listing long and universally known facts. For instance, to quote from the part in the DU program entitled Economics: "the system of remuneration based not on labor but on some putative human needs set by someone at the top leads to a situation whereby in many fields of activity wages in practice do not reflect final results. Arbitrary reduction of pay rates, overtime, storming, leveling of wages, rounding of numbers, etc. are common. Given the low standard of living and the enormous quantity of useless goods being produced, a massive quantity of money is not adequately covered by goods."

Had these words been written 5 or 6 years ago there could have been much delight. I can only imagine how much some fans of the sharply worded statement would have loved it. But to read something like this in a samizdat program a year ago, when the newspapers were already conducting a businesslike, serious discussion of ways to solve these and other complex economic problems, was, you must agree, a waste of time.

Or take another example. At a time when the practice of planning based on expected achievements had already been universally condemned, that issue was presented in the same section as some sort of revelation.

"Directive-based planning (I quote verbatim) becomes most harmful when it is achievement-based; it does not encourage but hampers development. Funds for the technological retooling of industry can be obtained only by rejecting directive-based planning, halting environmentally harmful development, ending the waste of labor, natural resources and energy, trimming state apparatus and liberating and raising the prestige of scientific and technological research."

Someone may retort by pointing out that the DU has held its second congress since then. It might have adopted a new economic program. True, the second DU congress was held last January in Riga. But the truth is that the congress merely confirmed the fact that DU members have no concrete proposals to improve the economic situation in the country.

There was but one statement on the subject, in the introduction to the new DU program: "We, the citizens of this country, feel responsible for its future and have joint in a political party called the Democratic Union, in

order to assist in the economic and spiritual renaissance of our society based on humanism, democracy and freedom." This was it for the good old economy, to use a colloquial expression.

The spiritual poverty of the program and its eclectic nature become especially salient when it is compared to the speeches of many deputies at the Congress of People's Deputies. During the Congress, DU forgot their program and grasped at the last straw: they were back staging rallies. And they resorted to bluff, trying to confuse passersby by creating the impression that they were organizing meetings between Muscovites and delegates. They would bring their white blue and red tricolors and loudspeakers to the sites where deputies had set up meetings with their constituents.

Sooner or later the DU leaders' bluff had to be called, no matter how hard they tried to disguise it. And it was.

Even some DU members, who describe today's situation as "life in the commissars' jungle" are beginning to doubt that their party really exists. In an article titled "Growing Pains" published in the samizdat SVOBODNOYE SLOVO (No.6, 1988), a certain A.Osin, having stated that "DU meetings are conducted in an awful manner so that in half an hour one loses ability to think and turns into a voting machine", admits that DU members probably did not have the right "to call themselves a political party. However, had the DU chosen to call itself a club, I would not have joined," writes Osin. "I do not think I am alone."

The fact that the author of the "Growing Pains" article is not alone in thinking this way is corroborated by a leaflet titled "Keep It Up, Democratic Union!" signed by DU central committee members A.Velikolepov and Yu.Denisov.

"When we were organizing the DU," states the leaflet, *"we were naive enough to hope that all of society's progressive forces, at least in Moscow, would immediately flock to it: artists, writers, scientists, engineers and in general all sane and patriotic people. It would doubtless include all old revolutionaries. (It is a rather unpleasant word, but we do not know how to term correctly, or at least in Russian, those known as dissidents.) But not even they joined the DU, although they share our goals. Why? At first, because the union was organized by a small group and later because its leaders turned out to be so incompetent. Indeed, it is one thing to gather in a kitchen and hold forth on political subjects before a handful of open-mouthed supporters and another to deal with leaders of other political movements or with inert masses and to find mutually acceptable solutions. Thus, kitchen politics took root in the DU..."*

Let me add that those politicians, having failed in their attempt to trick the progressives, quickly turned their attention elsewhere, to the very young. But this is a different story.

"Gentlemen, Please Spare Some Change"

At 3:00 p.m. on the Old Arbat I met with one such politician, Yu.Skubko, the DU's economics expert. He arrived and started telling me that the economic part of their program needed serious work and had to be developed further. "What about the second congress?" I asked. True, it was weak as far as the economic program was concerned. Currently, however, he was preoccupied with the economic condition of the DU itself: the party's finances needed infusions and financially the party was floundering. On the other hand, there was still hope for getting alms, in the form of voluntary contributions to the union. But fools willing to part with their dough to bankroll political gamblers are hard to come by. As a result, he had come to the Arbat accompanied by several young men and a woman. They pulled out paper bundles from their bags and started to shout: "Ladies and gentlemen, buy the SVOBODNOYE SLOVO!"

Each one of them, of course, had his own life story, and each his own reasons for falling into the DU trap. Now they were selling a few copies of their weekly publication, charging R1 each. And what about tomorrow? There would probably be another rally. But they knew nothing about it as yet, for even though since their first days in the DU they heard that they were free citizens, the politicians (or gentlemen, the form most commonly used in the union) decide everything for them. But they no longer have the option to refuse. Having become a member of the DU, one must follow instructions. Every small thing is regimented. For instance, they are told how to behave at rallies or at the militia station. Especially at the latter. They are even encouraged to do time for others, which is an idea advocated by their leader Novodvorskaya. In her open letter "To Those Who Did Not Come Out" (SVOBODNOYE SLOVO, No.6, 1988) she comes down hard on other unofficial organizations who did not attend one of DU rallies. She also announces happily that she was detained and that the only thing she requested of the high officials of the MVD who came to visit her in jail was to leave her in her cell a little longer so that she could continue her hunger strike. She calls on young people to follow her example and engage in similar self-immolation. Whenever they land up at the militia station, DU leaders analyze afterwards how rank-and-file DU behaved during the rally. Indeed, the DU has placed its hopes on young people; it hopes that they will fall for the samizdat leaflets appearing in the city with increasing regularity.

During the Congress of People's Deputies, DU agent-provocateurs distributed an appeal to the People's Deputies calling on the people's representatives "to quit the congress hall, setting a precedent of civil disobedience, and work independently declaring themselves the Congress of the Democratic Minority."

What is most surprising is that the head of the agitation and propaganda department of the DU A.Gryaznov, who gave me that appeal, continues to teach at the Moscow public school No.828, where he probably

teaches other things besides physics to older students. The parents are horrified what the students learn in his classes.

Yet, the numerous appeals for help to the Tushino rayon party committee on the part of Z. Ananina, the school's principal, have been fruitless: the appeals invariably end up on the desk of the former head of the Rayon Public Education Department and currently a high official at the USSR State Committee for Public Education Z. Gryaznova, the mother of the very same extraordinary physics teacher.

What can one add to all this? After decades of silence and unanimous approval we have finally begun to feel a little less self-conscious and more free. This is largely the result of glasnost, without which I can not envision the future of perestroika. I do not have any doubt that we need pluralism of opinion, which would allow us to develop proposals aimed at solving the crisis situation in the country. But let us not forget that some forces are ready lead us astray from the task of solving important economic and political problems and dream of plunging the country into the abyss of strikes and internecine fighting. We must keep it in mind if we want to live better, not worse.

Kishinev Leaders, Workers on Responsibility for 28 June Events

18001467 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 8 Jul 89 p 3

[Interviews with four members of the Kishinev City Party Committee Buro by ATEM correspondents: "Time's Interviews"; date and place not specified]

[Text] Telephones in the ATEM (Moldavian Telegraph Agency) offices have not stopped ringing in recent days. People are disturbed about whether an end will be put to the irresponsible actions by certain representatives of informal associations, such as those which occurred in Kishinev on 28 June. The callers remind us that M.S. Gorbachev, in his speech broadcast on Central Television, said that everyone must obey the laws of the country in which he lives, and that only this can guarantee a citizen's rights regardless of his nationality.

ATEM correspondents addressed the following questions to several members of the Kishinev City Party Committee Buro:

1. *Who, in your opinion, bears political responsibility for the events of 28 June in the city?*

2. *What is your attitude toward the socio-political situation which has developed in the city?*

3. *What concrete measures have been undertaken or should be undertaken to normalize it?*

4. *A decree by the Kishinev City Party Committee and the ispolkom of the city soviet was published in the press. What is meant by the wording which it contains: "...give a*

decisive rebuff to all those who incite people to disorder, who consciously try to convert democracy into license, who utilize the slogans of perestroika to assert selfish, factional interests?"

I.I. Leshanu, second secretary of the Kishinev City Party Committee:

1. It is clear that one cannot put the responsibility for the events of 28 June on specific people or on specific organizations of the city. That is too serious an accusation to make against them. At the same time there is an obvious link between what was said at the rally which was held on 25 June and the actions which people took on 28 June. At that rally, which was held in Victory Square, it was stated that June 28th was the day of occupation, a day of mourning. It was there that judgment was passed on the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact. The organizers of the rally did not react in the necessary manner to all of these utterances. And what took place on 28 June was a logical continuation of the events of 25 June.

2. It is negative, of course. The organizers of unsanctioned measures are imposing their interpretation of problems on other people by ignoring their opinions. They offended many people for whom the 28th of June is a holiday of liberation, a day which marks the reunification of the Moldavian people. No one disputes the fact that tragic mistakes were made. There was, for example, the deportation of people, which was a great misfortune for thousands of families. Such actions have been decisively condemned both by the working people and the official organs. But it is not right to see only black in our past, as do many of my fellow countrymen, unfortunately.

3. The events of 28 June have stirred up not only the city but the entire republic as well. At a joint session of the city committee buro and the ispolkom of the city soviet we unambiguously condemned the actions of people who persistently attempt to destabilize the situation in Moldavia. According to our information certain communists participated in the unsanctioned rally. The primary party organizations have been entrusted with the job of issuing a general political evaluation of every one of them, and this is already being done. The law-enforcement organs have instituted criminal proceedings based on the instances of hooliganism and violations of public order. Propaganda groups have been established and sent to labor collectives to explain the situation. Other measures are also being taken to improve it and to consolidate forces.

4. I have already answered this question in part. For this reason additional commentary on this decree is hardly needed. I only want to add that its implementation must become the vital business of every citizen in the city. While it is correct to criticize the party and soviet organs, they should not be assigned full responsibility for everything that took place. Painstaking work with the people is required. Together we must learn to defend our values;

together we must find ways out of the situation which has developed; we must learn to listen and heed our opponent. And everyone must start from the premise that further confrontation leads to a dead end.

V.F. Kilimchuk: chairman of the Kishinev City People's Control Committee:

1. I consider that the city committee, the city committee ispolkom and the leaders of the people's front are all guilty. Because what happened on 28 June did not arise out of nothing. The situation was festering for a long time; it required comprehensive analysis and appropriate actions.

2. It can be expressed in one word: concern. It is necessary, I repeat, to act, and it must be all together—the party and soviet organs, the law-enforcement organs, the labor collectives and the community at large.

The session of the city committee buro and the ispolkom of the city soviet at which the events of that day were considered could have been run more strictly. Nonetheless, I must note that this was the first time that such a frank conversation with individually-addressed criticism was held among us. Those who spoiled the June 28th holiday removed once and for all their disguises as people who welcome perestroika.

The organizers of the holiday could not have expected such open action. But some unbridled supporters of the people's front utilized the operating principle of the so-called democratic alliance—open disobedience of the authorities. Under these conditions the administrative organs should apply the appropriate sanctions specified by the law.

3. I suggest that it is necessary to regulate the procedures for holding large meetings and rallies. I have in mind participation in these events on equal terms by party and soviet workers, and by the intelligentsia. As everyone knows, the informal organizations do not allow them to speak. Where then is pluralism of opinions? It turns out that they are for it only in words.

I think it is necessary to improve the party leadership of the creative unions and of the editorial boards of newspapers, magazines, and especially of Gosteleradio (State Committee for Television and Radio). We need to be more active in using the mass information media to expose the position of those informal leaders who allow themselves, to put it mildly, an incorrect interpretation of events as well as attacks which are in essence anti-constitutional.

4. The force of the law must be utilized more fully to establish order. The law-enforcement organs must act more decisively. The party organizations should make strict demands on communists whose deeds are not in accordance with the requirements of the CPSU Charter.

I.Z. Kotorobay, adjuster at the Kishinev Tractor Plant Production Association:

1. In the current situation it is first of all the leadership of the republic which is to blame. I would say that at the present time the situation has practically gone beyond the control of the party, soviet and Komsomol organs. A year ago, when all kinds of informal movements were just starting up, few officials of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet or the Moldavian SSR Sovmin (Council of Ministers) were interested in their platforms, tasks and goals; few of them met with people on the streets and in labor collectives or explained to them the essence of the most controversial points. Some of the blame should also be laid at the door of the primary party organizations. Some communists do not know how to conduct themselves in the current situation; they simply do not understand many questions, and they are not able to conduct a dialog with opponents.

2. The situation is critical. It must not go on this way. The situation is in urgent need of correction.

3. The "primary people" must speak with authority. Communists, especially those who work in elected party organs, must meet with the leaders of informal associations and support constructive undertakings; they must use the strength of the party's word to convince people of the incorrectness and bankruptcy of certain positions held by these movements. A frank dialog will contribute to the elimination of tension.

4. It is essential to take the most decisive measures stipulated by law against extremists who fan inter-nationality differences, and who pursue narrow factional interests.

L.P. Onanko: brigade leader of the Grazhdanstroy Building Trust:

1. I think that a large share of the responsibility for the extremely tense situation which has recently developed in the republic lies with the organizers and the people who are the source of ideological inspiration for the unsanctioned rallies and marches. And the measures permitted by the city committee ispolkom frequently—and moreover with their direct participation—go beyond the limits stipulated to them in advance. These leaders consciously inflame the situation, taking advantage of the people's long-standing dissatisfaction with the state of affairs both in the socio-economic and the political areas of our life. And it must be recognized that they work much more energetically among the masses than do many communists, who only "now and then" explain to the working people all of the dangers inherent in the further growth of tension or who shrink from this altogether.

2. The situation is very difficult. I say that because many people, mainly Russian-speakers, are coming to me with concern about the increased friction in the area of inter-nationality relations. Some of them are even afraid to go to the center of the city on Sundays.

3. It is essential to shift the focus of all work directly to the labor collectives of enterprises, schools and other institutions and organizations. After all, any improvement in the current situation will depend largely on the position taken by the working people and students. It is time for communists to reject office work. It is only in direct contact with the people that the party can increase its prestige and strengthen the people's faith in the irreversibility of the policy of perestroika, which is now being implemented.

4. In my opinion, the wording is extremely clear. And in order to prevent these words from remaining only on paper the republic's leadership must adopt appropriate laws which would stipulate responsibility for the organization of disorders and for insults to people's national feelings, etc.

Georgians Surveyed on 9 April, Congress of People's Deputies

18300784

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian carries on 1 August 1989 on page 7 a 1,300 word article by A. Lutskiy and V. Kvaratskheliya, both candidates of philosophy, titled "The Results of a Sociological Survey." The article reports the findings of a survey of public opinion conducted in Tbilisi on 18-26 July by sociologists of the GSSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting. "Virtually all sections of the population, including both Georgians and non-Georgians," took part in the survey.

On the question as to who was responsible for the events of 9 April (those surveyed were not limited to a single choice), 78 percent of the participants blamed the central leadership of the country, 70 percent considered that the

fault lay primarily with the republic leadership, and another 70 percent blamed the leadership of the army. 4 percent of those surveyed answered that the population itself was responsible for the tragedy, and one in twenty blamed the leaders of informal associations.

When asked about the primary causes of the 9 April events the overwhelming majority of those surveyed answered that the main reasons were the "mistaken policies" of the central (77 percent) and republic (52 percent) leaderships. One in five considered that the events were the results of the "political immaturity" of the population. Questioned about other factors leading to the tragedy, 22 percent pointed to the deterioration of the republic's economic situation; 18 percent, to the exacerbation of interethnic relations in Georgia; and 17 percent, to informal associations. 10 percent saw in the 9 April events a manifestation of the results of the "excessive activation" of the processes of glasnost.

Opinions on the work of the recent Congress of People's Deputies were also solicited. 82 percent of the survey participants followed the activity of the Congress, and 65 percent of that number reported that they did not miss a single session. The Congress, however, did not receive a high evaluation. Only two percent of those questioned reported themselves satisfied with the work of the deputies. One in five considered that the Congress's decisions amounted to no more than partial resolutions for the vital problems facing the country, and three fourths indicated that they felt that the Congress had accomplished virtually nothing. The authors of the article note that the reason for this critical attitude was undoubtedly the Congress's review of the April events. 68 percent felt that the reports on the events presented at the Congress were distorted, and only four percent stated that they agreed with the Congress's evaluation of what had actually taken place.

Transcarpathian Oblast 1st Secretary on Nationalism

18001437 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Jul 89 p 10

[Interview with Genrikh Iosifovich Bandrovskiy, first secretary of the Transcarpathian Obkom of the Ukrainian CP, by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA special correspondent A. Golovchanskiy: "Definitely Together!"; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] **The first secretary of the Transcarpathian Obkom of the Ukrainian CP responds to questions from LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's special correspondent.**

[Correspondent] Genrikh Iosifovich, in making the arrangements for our meeting, we both had in mind the CPSU Central Committee Plenum planned for July. It has only now become known: the time frame for this has been postponed, it seems, until September...

[Bandrovskiy] The Central Committee's Politburo decided to send for examination by the central committees of the union republics' communist parties the draft of the CPSU platform on ethnic policies under contemporary conditions before conducting the plenum. In my opinion, this is a correct and necessary step. It will not do any harm for all of us to weigh everything once again in today's complicated situation. In brief, there is time—ask your questions.

[Correspondent] For Transcarpathia, just as for the country's other border regions, the ethnic question has always remained one of no little importance. What is your assessment of the current interethnic relations in the region?

[Bandrovskiy] If we talk about the region's specific features, which make their own imprint on the state and development of interethnic relations, then they consist of the following. The border location of the oblast. It is adjacent to four socialist states—the HPR [Hungarian People's Republic], the CSSR, the PPR [Polish People's Republic] and the SRR [Socialist Republic of Romania]. The multi-ethnic make-up of the population—living in our area are more than 40 nationalities and ethnic groups, among whom 77.8 percent are Ukrainians, 13.7 percent—Hungarians, 3.6 percent—Russians, 2.4 percent—Romanians, 0.7 percent—Slovaks, 0.5 percent—Gypsies, 0.3 percent each—Germans and Jews... The relative youth of Soviet Authority—the reunification of the Transcarpathian Ukraine with the UkSSR was completed just in 1945. As you see, our region is a very complex one and requires unusual solutions.

If we assess the contemporary state of interethnic relations in the oblast, then they are, in my opinion, normal, which make it possible to sustain in the collectives a healthy moral and psychological climate and an amicable labor rhythm. No language or other kind of tension is evident in the work medium. It is more complicated, of course, with the young people and the intelligentsia,

but even here we find reasonable compromises... I do not know of any instances of open antagonism or hostility on an ethnic basis and, in general, of serious complications between representatives of the different peoples. We see in this the results of the many years of work by the party organizations on the interethnic unity of the workers.

At the same time, just like everywhere else, the process of politization of the masses and the stormy growth of national self-consciousness have also touched our populace to the fullest extent. People are seeking new moral guideposts and are asking sharp questions concerning social, economic and ecological problems and the more complete satisfaction of their own cultural needs.

[Correspondent] Facts of recent vintage (Fergana, Novyy Uzen) have again underscored the close relationship between the social and economic conditions of life and ethnic relations. Is a balance here being achieved in your oblast?

[Bandrovskiy] It must be stated frankly that, again, just like everywhere else, there is a negative effect being exerted on the state of interethnic relations by the chronic shortage of goods, the slowness in the solution of the problems of the social infrastructure and the errors in the realization of economic reform. Life is becoming not simpler, but rather, more complicated. And each passing day confirms the fact that the more tense our economic relations, the more perceptible there the disunity of people on the basis of the most differing reasons, including ethnic ones. And, conversely, the better the life of the people and the stronger the economy, the stronger the perception of community. It must not be forgotten that the hundreds of thousands of inhabitants of the oblast, in visiting relatives, acquaintances and friends in the neighboring countries, have an opportunity to compare directly their standard of living and social organization.

Therefore, we are aiming the efforts of the labor collectives, first of all, at the production of consumer goods, foodstuffs and the development of the social sphere. We are attempting to find optimum solutions for such an acute problem in our oblast as the employment of the populace. For this purpose, we are developing in every way possible the folk cottage industries and we are encouraging individual construction. Of course, not everything is successful today. There are a lot of complications with the saturation of the market and the shortage of meat, building materials and household equipment is being felt sharply. Although the oblast's industry and agriculture are operating on the whole, in our opinion, in a stable fashion.

I believe that, in the course of the new ethnic policy, now, for us, there is no more important task than ensuring a sensible and just approach to the solution of the problems disturbing one or another ethnic group, regardless of its numerical composition. For example, out of our 693 general education schools, instruction is being done in 588 of them in Ukrainian, in 50—in

Hungarian, in 14—in Russian and in 13—in Moldavian. In nearly 50 schools, there are classes in parallel instruction in Hungarian, Moldavian, Russian and Ukrainian. Also operating are nearly 400 language departments and study circles. We are publishing newspapers and books in four ethnic languages and broadcasting on television and radio.

The structure of the mass media is being directed more and more toward the language and cultural demands and needs of the populace. Last year, for example, we began to publish in Hungarian the literary and artistic almanac EYVDYURYUK (Annual Rings) and a literature and advertising supplement to the newspaper KARPATI IGAZ SO—UY GOYTASH (New Shoots). An integral program for the publication of books in Ukrainian, Hungarian and Moldavian has been worked out by the Karpaty Publishing House. At Uzhgorod University, a Soviet Center for Hungarian Studies has been established.

Ukrainian and Russian drama theaters are operating in the oblast. A professional Hungarian theater is being organized, based at the Beregovskiy Folk Theater. A new impetus in connection with the conducting of festivals of folk creativity was given to amateur art—we have 600 Hungarian, 52 Romanian and 10 German collectives of independent artistic endeavors. Just last year, in areas densely inhabited by the Hungarian populace, eight houses of culture and clubs, seven childrens preschool institutions, three schools and four medical institutions were constructed. Over this same period, in villages with a Romanian population, 12 social and cultural projects were started. We are also getting away from the old-fashioned principle for financing culture. This year, the per capita allotment for culture for the oblast is 11.4 rubles. For comparison: in the UkSSR, it is 9.8 rubles and, in the RSFSR, it is 7.3 rubles.

Nevertheless, it is still too early to assert unambiguously that we have achieved a perfect balance between the level of social and economic development and the solution of interethnic questions. It is absolutely required now that there be new approaches and new principles in the organization of social and cultural affairs. We still need to do an awful lot of work in order to establish a durable material base for satisfying the intellectual needs of all the ethnic groups. At the same time, we will not forget that the ethnic and the social and economic problems have become so intertwined and have merged together that they must be solved together—combining the efforts for the creation of conditions for free and fully creative labor.

[Correspondent] The national movements and people's fronts have become a widespread phenomenon. What is the situation in Transcarpathia from this point of view? Are there problems with language and the preservation of national cultural values?

[Bandrovskiy] Let us place the emphases correctly. We are for assisting perestroika in any form and, therefore,

we believe that we should not shut ourselves off from the informal associations, even if their positions are not always constructive. We are striving to conduct a dialogue with them and to direct the energy of the healthy forces to the benefit of renewal. But, at the same time, we are not flirting with anyone and we are coming out against those positions of their programs which contain aspects unacceptable from the point of view of socialism. There are groups which are taking upon themselves the functions of revisers of history, while, in essence, they are trying to place themselves over society, to create social tension and political instability and to drive a wedge between the representatives of the different ethnic groups.

What causes concern for me personally is the fact that the numerous troubles, with which we are living, have overshadowed a truly scientific elaboration of the problems of interethnic relations. Not always positive here, in my opinion, is the role of the press, particularly the literary magazines. Frequently, it seems to me, not very competent people speak out on these questions. Their proposals are weighed inadequately. In any case, the example of our oblast shows how complicated and delicate the theme is and how dangerous it is to deal with it on a non-professional level.

And there is more. I believe it is very important for us to have systematic control and sociological forecasting of the moral and political situation in the workers' collectives according to place of residence also. Without this, it is difficult today to amend as necessary our activities for the improvement of interethnic relations. This type of experience generally does arise, but still slowly. In the party obkom, there is a group which performs rapid analysis of the political situation and a unique system for the study of public opinion is being tried.

If we return to the problem of language, then I want to emphasize that the majority of the populace in Transcarpathia is fluent in several languages and, therefore, in essence, there is no language barrier in the intercourse of the ethnic groups. Nevertheless, a program has been prepared for expansion of the sphere of functioning of the Ukrainian language. This is important for the republic. On the initiative of the Ukrainian Language Society imeni T. G. Shevchenko, celebrations of the native language are being conducted in the educational institutions and a special commission has been organized, which is preparing proposals for regulating the naming of streets and for bringing order into advertising and a number of other similar problems.

A great deal of attention is being paid to the preservation of the ethnic culture and the native language by the recently established Society for the Hungarian Culture of Transcarpathia. In particular, operating within its framework are 11 amateur associations and clubs. We believe that the work with such independent associations is, first of all, political work.

[Correspondent] How are the oblast's economic and cultural contacts with the bordering regions of the neighboring countries shaping up? Are there any kinds of joint enterprises or companies? How are personnel ties with relatives being maintained?

[Bandrovskiy] Of course, it would be shortsighted not to make use of the opportunities inherent in border cooperation. We have had such ties for a long time. Naturally, now they have become more business-like and have a solid material base. It is sufficient to say that the more than 280 associations, enterprises and organizations are engaged in foreign economic activities.

However, it would be wrong to close our eyes also to the fact that the majority of the partners are limiting their ties only to the conducting of goods exchange operations. By far, not all contracts are being fulfilled due to departmental barriers, the lack of funds, limits, compensating materials and start-up capital.

I would remind you that the Transcarpathian Oblast is unique thanks to its geographic location and climatic conditions. Available in its territory are all types of European mineral waters—nearly 400 sources. Only 30 of them are being exploited. Yet, meanwhile, one liter of mineral water in the world market is priced at \$1.50. Enormous reserves have also been concealed in the relaxation industry and tourism... Briefly, has not the time arrived to raise the question of granting the oblast the status of a free economic zone?

In our opinion, it is absolutely necessary to include in the long-term plans of the CEMA member nations special sections, in which would be reflected the questions of border cooperation and the development of the regions' export potential and the production and social infrastructure.

The amicable contacts in the sphere of culture are of a versatile nature. The friendship concerts scheduled for the 9th of May at the Soviet-Czechoslovak border in Uzhgorod have become traditional, as well as those in Kishvarde (the HPR) and the international friendship festivals in the Beregovskiy Rayon. Writers are also developing their own forms of cooperation: they are translating the productions of Slovak and Hungarian colleagues, setting up literature festivals and publishing joint books...

In October, in our oblast, the first International Theatrical Arts Festival, "Intertheater," will be held.

Separately, as you ask, I will tell about the ties of the oblast's residents with relatives living in the bordering countries. More than 150,000 people, nearly one person in eight living in Transcarpathia, are maintaining them. Annually, more than 100,000 inhabitants make private trips. One significant fact: in connection with the opening of points for simplified crossings at the Soviet-Hungarian, Soviet-Czechoslovakian and Soviet-Romanian borders, just in the first half-year, more than a million people have made mutual trips. This year,

2,763 groups of representatives of labor collectives (around 25,000 people) travelled to similar oblasts of the neighboring socialist countries.

[Correspondent] How was M. S. Gorbachev's address to the Soviet people on 1 July on Central Television received by the inhabitants of Transcarpathia?

[Bandrovskiy] The letters and oral comments of citizens who visited us and the nature of the meetings which occurred in the labor collectives indicate that Comrade Gorbachev's address was harmonious with the mood of the inhabitants of the Transcarpathian Oblast. They are alarmed by the fact that irresponsible extremist elements in their own far-ranging political goals are sowing discord and enmity among the people, are bringing grief and are forcing people to abandon their native homes. The stirring up of interethnic conflicts, the use of the difficulties of the social and economic system, the inciting of people to participate in strikes and the unsanctioned meetings are inflicting harm on perestroika and the constructive solution of pressing problems.

The inhabitants of multi-ethnic regions, as I have satisfied myself repeatedly, are convinced of the necessity of developing the ethnic languages and culture and ethnic schools. For example, Stepan Sheresh, team leader of the Beregovskiy Furniture Combine, believes that the rayon's traditional trilingualism facilitates the amicable ties between peoples and the growth of professional skill and has a favorable effect on the solution of management problems. He and his friends, in supporting Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's address, have called upon the oblast's populace to strengthen interethnic unity and to protect and increase the splendor of the native province—our cradle and common home.

[Correspondent] Genrikh Iosifovich, I want to return to the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on the problems of interethnic relations. What, in your opinion, needs to be solved at it first of all?

[Bandrovskiy] What do we expect from the plenum? First of all, the working out of a genuinely new ethnic policy which is guided by the Leninist concept of interethnic relations, but, taking into account those large changes in real life and in public practice which have occurred over the recent decades. We expect attention to those legal forms which would regulate inter-republic and inter-oblast relations and provide the citizens with guarantees for the satisfaction of intellectual and cultural needs. By far, in my opinion, the question about the place of religion in ethnic and interethnic relations is not of minor importance.

In the oblast party organization, the accumulated experience is being analyzed and re-interpreted and approaches to the solution of the accumulated problems are being studied. And of interest to us is the experience not only of our republic, but also that of the neighboring socialist countries. We are seeking and we are thinking... It is likely that our position here is also not an original

one. However, not for nothing did M. S. Gorbachev speak at a meeting in the Central Committee that week that, no matter how complicated our life is and no matter how many unusual acute situations are encountered in it, it is necessary to meddle more boldly in the social processes.

We have sent our own proposals to the CPSU Central Committee. Needed are recommendations for the study of the native and Russian languages, history and culture in multi-ethnic schools. It would be nice to send for studies at the higher educational institutions of the socialist countries students from the Hungarian, Romanian, Czech and Slovak nationalities, who live in the oblast's territory. It is necessary to organize a printing base in the border regions in order to improve the degree to which the people are informed and to provide on a rapid basis socio-political, artistic and educational literature (in the languages of the ethnic groups) and the publication of phrase books. The international agreements pertaining to international ties between our border oblasts and the neighboring socialist countries need to be amended...

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum, in our opinion, should work out a public mechanism which would make it possible to use the processes of democratization and glasnost for the benefit of the interethnic unity of the USSR's peoples. Today, we all need the CONSOLIDATION of people in joint practical matters for the good of the people. This is the basic question of the day.

Lithuanian Editor Addresses Russians' Stance on Language Issue

*18001398 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
29 Jun 89 p 1*

[Article by A. Gelbakh: "Pseudo-Patriotism and the Realities of Perestroika"]

[Text] "SOVETSKAYA LITVA is the mouthpiece of Sajudis." "The leadership of the republic follows absolutely the dictates of Sajudis, the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement; it is incapable of defending the rights of the working people and the security of their families." "Betrayers of Marxism-Leninism." That is a small but expressive selection of "accusations" from the proclamations of Yedinstvo and from letters by certain "faithful" adherents of the movement addressed to the editor of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA LITVA.

What can be said on this subject? A complex process of political and national rebirth of the people is taking place in Lithuania. It is completely natural that this process is proceeding unevenly through a difficult quest, which does not always lead to well-tested solutions. But that is all the more reason not to get into a panic or to resort to useless attempts to define everything taking place with one sharp and sometimes (it is not easy to overcome the strength of habit) abusive Russian word. Is it not a noble task to set oneself instead the job of thinking a bit, of trying to understand and analyze events—a task which

every honest person must set himself, especially the person who thinks of himself, as do many Russians, as an a priori (born) internationalist?

On 12 February of this year, at rally in Vilnius attended by a hundred thousand, Yedinstvo demanded the repeal of the Ukase on the Use of the Lithuanian Language. And at present this demand continues to be heard in "fiery" memoranda, resolutions and in the speeches of the movement's orators, who today speak to incomparably smaller audiences. They see in the Ukase the violation of the rights of population groups in Lithuania who speak other languages. And frequently they reduce the equality of rights to the need to give Russian the status of state language or to revoke this status for Lithuanian. Both alternatives seem to be practically unacceptable and theoretically unsound. Why? I will try to answer briefly.

Vladimir Ilich Lenin in his time considered the multi-ethnic composition of Russia and categorically opposed Russian as the state language. He thought that Russian would be the language of interethnic contact because all the nationalities and ethnic groups which populate this enormous country would accept it **voluntarily**. While the complete equality of the rights of all languages has been proclaimed, objectively the Russian language, because it is known by the overwhelming majority of the population, enjoys under these conditions actual inequality and is widely disseminated.

It is very tempting to transfer this arrangement to a union republic, to Lithuania, let us say. After all, the circumstances seems to fit almost exactly: the majority of the population knows Lithuanian, which means that an actual inequality develops here, which should lead to the mastery of the language of the indigenous nationality by all residents. From this it follows that in Lithuania, too, one state language is unacceptable; it does violence to all the other-language groups which appeal for equal rights. Originally the Yedinstvo movement, including the author of these lines, defended this kind of viewpoint very sincerely.

But we stumbled across a clear observation by Vladimir Ilich Lenin, which fundamentally changes everything. In it he demands "the introduction of the strictest rules with regard to the use of the nationality language in the other-nationality republics which constitute our Union..." and he emphasized: "Here a detailed code is required which can be compiled with any degree of success only by those nationals living in the given republic." And this is not a matter of the absolute authority of Leninist thought, which for many decades we accepted "on faith," without thinking about it in depth. The essence of the matter is that a system without a state language is acceptable for a nationality republic only if it has complete political, economic, territorial and cultural independence. Then the language of the indigenous nationality naturally occupies the place which belongs to it by right and develops freely. With an uncontrolled migration process and open borders, there

is always a risk that a neighbor which is numerically stronger will suppress not only the nationality language but also the entire nationality culture. Thus the adoption of a law on the state language and a code concerning its use is a normal defensive reaction by a people who are striving to preserve their uniqueness.

In this connection the appeal which the Yedinstvo supporters make with regard to giving Russian the status of state language in the republic looks all the more unacceptable and even ridiculous. In order to justify this proposal, completely invalid references are made to the example of Finland, where, despite the relatively small number of Swedes living in the country, their language is called a state language on equal terms with Finnish. The comparison is not accurate because the discussion concerns a sovereign state. In this state the law was adopted voluntarily on the basis of democratic motives because the ethnic boundaries of neighboring peoples often do not coincide with geographical boundaries. And whether the passionate adherents of Yedinstvo wish it or not, objectively they—by supporting the appeal to introduce Russian as a state language in Lithuania—are acting in favor of the republic's withdrawal from the Union of SSR's. And if this is not what they wish (and judging by everything, it is not), then it is possible that Yedinstvo is unintentionally not just falling but rather rushing headlong into the "chauvinism of the Black Hundreds," to use Lenin's expression, by insisting on the right to create abuses of a "purely Russian quality."

The same may be said about the demand to introduce Russian as a state language throughout all of the Soviet Union. Only in this case the so-called internationalists are not opposing one specific people; instead they are manifesting a complete lack of concern for the free development of all nationalities and ethnic groups in the country; they are taking a position of Stalinist assimilationism.

Genuine internationalism (not the illusory kind) is "for" the national rebirth of numerically small peoples; it contributes to this in every way possible. But at the same time that it recognizes the features and uniqueness of every ethnic group, this kind of internationalism displays and illuminates those features common to all mankind which unite rather than divide us. And, of course, internationalists cannot ignore or pass by with indifference attempts to turn a healthy national movement into "caveman" nationalism, when ideas approaching that of a "higher race" are propagandized arrogantly and pretentiously, when the dignity and honor of representatives of all peoples except their own are humiliated for no particular reason. Unfortunately, the national renewal process of the Lithuanian people, especially in the beginning, was not free of manifestations of nationalism. Some of its "pioneers" and propagandists allowed themselves to make absolutely offensive comments directed at the Russian and Polish population of Lithuania and tried to arouse anti-Russian sentiments. And, alas, to some extent they succeeded.

But while he struggles against such views, a genuine internationalist, in this particular case as well, is obliged to display the maximum understanding and patience. The truth (possibly not absolute, but close to it) is that nationalism is the sharpest reaction to chauvinism. It is a reaction to the complete trampling of the Leninist principle of the **voluntary** adoption of the language of interethnic communication and the forced Russification of the local population, which went on for decades, and finally, a reaction to the ill-considered (or was it a considered?) policy of the central agencies under which thousands and thousands of Russians and representatives of other nationalities and ethnic groups in the country settled—not by their own choice—in the republic; they "intruded" into the territory of the ethnic group and frequently conducted themselves like "uninvited guests." Unless we understand the entire constellation of these problems we sink into hysterics and bitterness, which inevitably lead to a dead-end conflict situation.

Then the vocabulary of the speakers at rallies and the writers of letters to the editor begin to contain strong words and phrases, which in no way reflect the real picture. For example, "fascist elements," "social-chauvinists," "social-traitors" etc. etc. Ignorance and stupidity, unfortunately, are always aggressive. But fortunately they do not have a grip on the broad strata of our society. Evidence of that can be seen, in my view, in the definite isolation of the "League of Freedom for Lithuania," and the obvious decline in the prestige of Yedinstvo. But now one can even treat with a certain irony those individuals who express in hyper-emotional ways the interests of these—to give them their due—quite cohesive groups, without exaggerating, of course, the dangers of the sentiments which they are propagandizing. This is what Aleksandr Yeremenko did in his poem "Desinformatsiya" (Disinformation) when he "naively" asked: "What are you going on about, red patriots?"

In conclusion, I would like to say that it would not be completely honest of me to declare my full support for the Ukase on the Use of the Lithuanian Language. Given the lack of facilities to study the language, including the shortage of teachers and textbooks, the deadlines specified in the Ukase for the transition to the conduct of all business in Lithuanian appear unrealistic. The declaration of a state language presumes state responsibility for its dissemination. At present, however, there is not enough acceptance of that responsibility. But perhaps this is just one more objection. It is another matter that legislative acts concerning interethnic relations in the republic and regulations on the use of other languages are necessary. As far as I know, they are being formulated.

And a few more words about the betrayal of "Marxism-Leninism." In the letters from our readers this thesis has appeared in connection with the discussion of the sovereignty of the republic, the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the change in its status. In order to "betray" Marxism-Leninism you must at least

study it and know it. But once again some people do not want to take the trouble to read and think a bit. An obvious example is the sharply polemical speech given by R. Gudaytis, secretary of the primary party organization of the republic's Union of Writers, at the last plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. Before the speech he had forebodings about accusations of "separatism" and "revisionism," as well as "opportunism." And they were certainly heard. But here is one "seditious" proposal by R. Gudaytis: accept believers into the party. But is this proposal so innovative or "revolutionary?" I quote from Lenin: "If a priest comes to us for joint political work and conscientiously carries out party work, without opposing the party platform, then we can accept him into the ranks of Social Democrats. And we must not only allow but also actively attract to the Social Democratic Party all working people who retain a belief in God; we are definitely against the slightest offense to their religious convictions..." And Marxism-Leninism does not interpret the independence and autonomy of party organizations so unambiguously as it seems to some of our readers. But we will talk about that next time.

MSSR CP CC Ideology Department on Measures To Improve Study of Moldavian, Other Languages

18001476 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 15 Jul 89 p 2

[Press release by the Moldavian SSR CP Central Committee Ideology Department: "Additional Measures Are Needed"]

[Text] Progress in implementing the Moldavian CP Central Committee and Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers decrees "On Improving Moldavian Language Study in the Republic" and "On Improving Russian Language Study in the Moldavian SSR" has been analyzed in the Moldavian CP Central Committee. It has been noted that certain work to create the necessary conditions for improving the study of the languages by the republic's students and adult population has been done by the city and rayon party committees, executive committees of City and Rayon Soviets of People's Deputies, ministries, state committees and departments, educational establishments, and scientific institutions.

The network of preschool institutions and general education schools is being improved. In 1988, there were established, in addition to those previously existing, 250 study groups in preschool institutions with Moldavian Language training, 23 Moldavian kindergartens, and 5 general education schools with Moldavian language teaching. In the current school year, 52.9 percent of the children and 59.9 percent of the pupils are being trained and taught, respectively, in Moldavian preschool institutions and general education schools.

The work to create conditions for improving study of the Moldavian and Russian languages has continued. In 8 rayons, 19 classes with intensive Moldavian language

study have been established, and the Russian language is being intensively studied at 30 schools. There are 1,087 elective courses being taught in the Moldavian language, and 918 in the Russian.

Curricula have been reviewed. The time for students' study of the Moldavian language has been increased during the intensive study of individual or series subjects in the higher grades. As of the present school year, the Moldavian language is also being studied in the Russian schools' elementary classes. The dividing of classes and study groups into subgroups to increase the effectiveness of Moldavian language study has been authorized in general education schools, vocational-technical schools, and secondary specialized education institutions with Russian language teaching. Moldavian language study has been initiated experimentally at the preschool institutions with Russian language training in five rayons of the republic.

Training of Moldavian language teachers for the Russian schools has been started at the Kishinev and Beltsy Pedagogical Institutes in order to provide the republic's educational institutions with qualified personnel. The enrollment of one group of future specialists in the Russian and national languages has been accomplished at the Kishinev Pedagogical Institute, and two groups are being trained in these specialties at the Kagul Teachers' School. In 1989, taking requirements of the preschool institutions and general education schools into account, enrollment at the pedagogical institutes and the state university was increased by a total of 250 persons for the training of Moldavian language specialists.

Of 1,379 groups of students in the vocational-technical schools, 817, or 59 percent, are being taught in the Moldavian language, including 262 of the 432 groups in the first year of training. The total number of study groups with Moldavian language teaching has been increased in the secondary specialized education institutions. Steps are being taken for a gradual changeover to teaching the specialized subject series at the vocational-technical schools and tekhnikum in the native language. At the present time, the teaching in the appropriate groups is done in the Moldavian language at 18 vocational-technical schools [PTU] and all of the teachers' schools. Instruction in the native language has begun in a number of subjects in the specialized series at industrial economics and industrial teaching tekhnikum. Beginning 1 September 1989, provision will be made for teaching all specialized series subjects in the Moldavian language in the appropriate study groups at all 10 of the secondary specialized education institutions subordinate to the republic's Ministry of National Education.

Beginning with the 1988-1989 school year, study groups and sections with Moldavian language teaching have been formed in the republic's higher education institutions. Thus, 19 groups have been formed at each medical, polytechnical, and agricultural institute. Curriculum development is in progress for a course in the Moldavian language for unspecialized departments.

Work on a new edition of the textbook "The Moldavian Language for Groups With Russian Language Teaching" is being completed. A practical course in the Moldavian language is being conducted in all teaching specialties at the republic's university and the pedagogical institutes. As of 1989, provision is being made in the technical higher educational institutions [VUZes] for elective study of the Moldavian language and the republic's history, as well as for elective study of the languages, histories, and cultures of the ethnic groups living in Moldavian SSR territory. Beginning with the 1989-1990 school year, instruction in Moldavian language and literature will be recommenced in the preparatory departments at the republic's VUZes.

Publication of the scientific methods journal LIMBA SHI LITERATURA MOLDOVENYASKE YN SHKOALE [in Moldavian] has begun. Steps are being taken to provide the educational process with new textbooks, teaching aids, and classroom materials. The work on producing dictionaries and other reference literature has been continued.

At the beginning of 1989, over 300 interest circles and groups were formed in the republic for adult citizens who had expressed a desire to study the Moldavian language. An instruction and a course curriculum have been prepared for adults wishing to study the Moldavian language, and an appropriate textbook is ready for publication. An experimental laboratory for teaching the Moldavian language on the basis of the latest intensive training methods, founded at the Beltsy State Pedagogical Institute imeni A. Russo, has been equipped and has begun operation.

Steps aimed at improving study of the Gagauz and Bulgarian languages are being taken in the appropriate schools. Curricula and lesson plans have been developed for these schools, and textbooks have been published. In the current school year, 62 percent of the students in the first to third and seventh to ninth grades are studying the Gagauz language, and 43.2 percent the Bulgarian, in the appropriate schools. Work is being done in regard to the needed textbooks, teaching aids, and classroom materials. A curriculum for training in the native language has been developed for kindergartens with Gagauz contingents, and an illustrated study methods aid will be published in 1990. An adapted curriculum, published by the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, is being used in the Bulgarian kindergartens.

The first steps toward also studying the other languages of peoples who have been living in Moldavian SSR territory since antiquity in the republic's schools were taken during the current school year. In Kamenskiy, Dubossarskiy, and Rybnitskiy Rayons, a part of 20 schools' pupils has begun studying the Ukrainian language. Two adult study groups and one children's study group have been formed in Kishinev since the fall of 1988 for those wishing to study Yiddish. The republic's Ministry of National Education has placed orders in the

RSFSR and the Ukrainian SSR for textbooks appropriate to the study of these languages.

A series of broadcasts about the problems of improving study of the languages has been developed on republic radio and television. The radio programs "Study of the Native Language: a Reality in Our Affairs," "Shkoala shi vyatsa" [in Moldavian], "Gray matern" [in Moldavian], "Se vorbim shi se skriem korekt" [in Moldavian], "The Living Word," "Literatura shi vyatsa" [in Moldavian], "Biblioteka literaturiy universale" [in Moldavian], "Limba noastre-y o komoare" [in Moldavian], "Duminika kuvyntelor" [in Moldavian], and "We Are Studying the Russian Language" are aired repeatedly.

As of 1989, the number of motion pictures translated into the Moldavian language has been increased. The Moldova-film movie studio is readying 20 full-length art films, 30 short-subject animated tapes, and 60 documentary film units for release.

However, the analysis showed that, because of the unfinished work of the republic's party gorkoms and raykoms, city rayon executive committees, ministries, and departments, and the existence of a number of substantive problems that will require a long time for solution, many of the aforementioned decrees' requirements remain unfulfilled, which negatively affects both the establishment of the language study and the decrees' serving their purpose.

Synchronous translation from the Moldavian language to the Russian and from the Russian language to the Moldavian is not being used in implementing the official measures. Work on the bilingual composition of signs, graphic agitation materials, announcements, and other publicity items has not been completed in the republic's towns and many of its villages.

The educational institutions' shortages of qualified personnel and weak material bases make it impossible to ensure a universal introduction of the Moldavian language into the Russian kindergartens' curricula, division of classes into subgroups when studying languages, formation of classes with intensive Moldavian language study, and a sufficient increase in the numbers of elective courses, interest circles, and courses, including those for the adult population. During the current school year, 197 teachers who lack the proper education are teaching Moldavian language and literature in general education schools. Moreover, the schools are not staffed with an adequate number of teachers. Kishinev needs 125 more Moldavian language teachers for support of the teaching and training process. Out of 752 classes in Tiraspol, only 86 are divided into groups during Moldavian language study, and over 50 percent of the teachers who are teaching the Moldavian language are not specialists in the field of Moldavian philology.

The state of affairs in the Russian language study area is slowly being corrected. There is a shortage of 200 Russian language teachers in the schools, 754 teachers have an extra workload exceeding 24 hours, 186 teachers are

not specialists, 275 schools do not have Russian language offices, and only 207 are provided with speech recording and reproducing equipment. In 1988, about 1,500 youths were found to have poor knowledge of the Russian language while undergoing basic military training before reaching draft age.

The problems of book support for the educational process are particularly acute, especially for the study groups with Moldavian language training in all departments and specialties of the republic's VUZes. The requirement for educational literature, just in the standard courses having fundamental significance for training specialists in the applicable specialties, amounts to more than 480 textbook titles, in 76 VUZ specialties and 10 secondary specialized and vocational-technical institution specialties, for the years 1991-1995.

Because of the changeover to teaching subjects of the specialized series in the Moldavian language at secondary specialized and vocational-technical institutions, it is necessary to translate over 3,000 syllabi and guides into the Moldavian language for the years 1991-1995. There are considerable difficulties in supplying the Moldavian language and literature courses at general education schools with textbooks.

The shortage of qualified teaching personnel and complete lack of textbooks and teaching aids for Moldavian language study by the adult population, and the imperfection of the methodologies for teaching that population have led to a significant curtailment of the study groups originally planned for it. For example, whereas 152 study groups, comprising 2,250 persons being taught, were functioning in January of the current year in the Kishinev City Department of Public Education system, there already are only 119, comprising 1,860 persons.

The abrupt reorientation necessitates replenishment of the holdings in the public libraries, where literature in the Moldavian language now constitutes only 34 percent of the total holdings.

In developing a comprehensive state program to ensure the languages in Moldavian SSR territory's performing their functions, it seems advisable to include a set of specific measures which, in certain time periods, and in combination with other applicable measures, will provide for:—the training of qualified teaching personnel for the appropriate specialties in sufficient numbers;—the creation of the requisite teaching materials base for the educational establishments and preschool institutions;—the development of modern, intensive methods of teaching the Moldavian language to the various population groups, and the changing over to these of the entire language teaching system;—curriculum-methodology equipping of the educational process, which meets the public education reform's needs, in children's preschool institutions and the educational institutions;—the selection and effective work of authors' collectives to prepare modern textbooks and teaching aids; and,—meeting the needs of all population

groups for the required number of dictionaries, conversational readers, self-teaching texts, and other forms of reference literature.

Tajik Language Law Prompts Arabic, Persian, Tajik Textbooks

18300785

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian on 8 August 1989 carries on page 3 a 200-word TadjikTA report entitled "An ABC of Arab Script" which describes the new textbook "Graphics and Orthography of the Tajik Classical Texts", by professor N. N. Kasymova as, in essence, the first republic primer for arabic script. Implemented within the framework of the Tajik Law on Language, this book is being published by "Maorif" Publishing House along with three others: "The Persian Language," "Teach Yourself Tajik," and "A Russian-Tajik School Dictionary." Special calligraphy was done for "Graphics and Orthography of the Tajik Classical Texts" by a young scientific coworker at the Institute of History, Archeology, and Ethnography imeni A. Donish of the TaSSR Academy of Sciences, Ekhsan Okilov, who contributed 18 folia to the text. K. G. Gafurov, director of "Maorif", explained the complex printing procedure for which regular typesetting would not suffice, saying that only a manuscript reproduction is capable of bringing out all the subtleties of arabic calligraphy.

Young Lithuanians Judge Komsomol

18001419 Vilnius KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 89 p 3

[Article by R. Alishauskene, chief of the Vilnius University Sociological Research Laboratory: "Lithuanian Youth On Komsomol. 1049 Young Men and Women Participated in Sociological Survey"]

[Text] The Vilnius University Sociological Research Laboratory conducted a sociological survey of the young men and women of Lithuania. The purpose of the survey was to study youth opinion on the direction of restructuring in the Komsomol, the functions of this organization, its relations with other organizations, as well as on the expectations of youth, related to the upcoming Komsomol Congress. In all, 1049 young residents of Lithuania participated in the survey. This number included representatives of various nationalities, and people of all ages, place of residence, and so on.

Of those surveyed, 21 percent never joined the VLKSM, 6 percent had been Komsomol members but had left the VLKSM, 14 percent are Komsomol members but intend to leave, 53 percent are rank-and-file Komsomol members, and 6 percent perform leadership work in the Komsomol.

The most respondents who had never joined the Komsomol was found among Poles (32 percent), and the most who had left the Komsomol (7 percent) or intended

to leave (15 percent) was found among Lithuanians—these are basically respondents between the ages of 16-23 years. Most young men and women who had left the Komsomol live in Vilnius (51 percent), and of those who plan to leave, the majority is also made up of residents of Vilnius (55 percent) and Kaunas (23 percent).

It can be confirmed that more than one-half of young people are not politically active, and an orientation in political activity has not been formed: 64 percent of youth did not display an interest in the drafts of new documents of the Lithuanian Komsomol and did not have an opinion on this subject. Seventy-two percent of those surveyed noted that they were not inclined to participate in the activity of youth political organizations. Thirty-five percent of youth were familiar with the drafts of the new Lithuanian Komsomol documents, and of them 8 percent did not approve of these documents, 8 percent have suggestions, and 19 percent entirely approve.

A significant share of young people think that the Lithuanian Komsomol should be an independent organization which supports comradesly ties with the youth organizations of other republics and countries (37 percent). Eleven percent noted that the Lithuanian Komsomol should remain a component part of the All-Union Komsomol (basically, the representatives of Russian nationality think so), 15 percent would like to reorganize the Komsomol into an association of democratic youth organizations, and 8 percent—into a socialist youth union of Lithuania. Twenty-six percent think that the Komsomol should be abolished. Thus, 86 percent of young people are in fact in favor of a substantial change in the designation of the Lithuanian Komsomol, including 49 percent in favor of transforming the Komsomol into a different youth organization.

Two-thirds of those surveyed noted that the Komsomol should be the equal partner of other youth organizations, 25 percent see no prospects for the Komsomol and think that other youth organizations should predominate, and 6 percent think that the Komsomol should coordinate the activity of other youth organizations.

As far as relations with the Communist Party are concerned, youth would like the Komsomol to be independent (69 percent): only 10 percent approve of the partnership relation, and 8 percent agreed that the Komsomol is the reserve of the party.

The representatives of different nationalities gave very different assessments of the direction of the reorganization of the Lithuanian Komsomol. Russians would like the Lithuanian Komsomol to remain a part of the All-Union Komsomol as an equal organization, and Lithuanians and Poles would like it to become an independent organization. Lithuanians, more often the representatives of other nationalities, spoke out in favor of an association of democratic youth organizations. Twenty-eight percent of Lithuanians, 28 percent of Poles, and 13 percent of Russians were in favor of

abolishing the Komsomol. Lithuanians and Poles more frequently emphasize the importance of the Komsomol's independence in relations with the party, while Russians more often consider the Komsomol the reserve or partner of the party.

Of university students, 34 percent favored abolishing the Komsomol organization, and 35 percent assert that the Komsomol has no prospects and that other organizations should dominate in the solution of youth problems. Another third of the students would like the reorganization of the Lithuanian Komsomol into an association of democratic youth organizations.

Schoolchildren, workers, and the intelligentsia are most of all interested in the processes of restructuring in the Komsomol, while PTU pupils and students are indifferent to these problems. PTU pupils are not politically active on the whole, while students are oriented more toward other youth organizations. Representatives of the intelligentsia are especially oriented toward other political youth organizations—36 percent are or plan to become members of such organizations, while 18 percent of them have left the VLKSM and 14 percent plan to leave.

In summarizing the above, it can be asserted that the youth of Lithuania is divided into several groups, whose views on the future of the Komsomol organization diverge. A general feature in the views of youth on these questions is that a significant part of the young men and women believe that the Komsomol should be essentially changed (and essence here means not only in designation, but also in its content and the tasks of its work). Its place in society's political system must be changed, since the majority of youth do not believe in a prospect for the Komsomol otherwise.

Balts Comment on Lithuanian Youth Congress

First Secretary of Estonian Komsomol

18001417 Vilnius KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 89 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Urmas Laanem, first secretary, Estonian Komsomol Central Committee, by R. Razmislyavichyute: "By The Same Token of Fate"]

[Text] I already wrote about the 7th All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Plenum ("Now or Later," 23 May 89). However, the strongest impression comes from acquaintance with people, whose curiosity about the problems of the Baltic inspired hope: apparently, we are coming to an understanding... The unity that I saw and felt while conversing with Estonians and Latvians is another matter. After the first day of the plenum, a suspicion crept in that there might not be information about the work of the Lithuanian Komsomol, or that it might not be too objective. This also brought us Balts together. History has determined a similar way of life for us, and therefore it is not strange that an evening was too brief for conversations.

This time, I offer the readers the viewpoints of two neighbors, Urmas Laanem and Ivars Preditis, on the subject of the plenum and youth.

Know Where You Are Going

[Razmislyavichyute] What distinguishes this work day for you?

[Laanem] This is not work, but rather simply sitting. I specially did not take the rostrum. I feel, I know that a bird does not fly without a goal, and it should know why it is flying.

And, going out and explaining something to the plenum participants, who are approximately a year behind us...

[Razmislyavichyute] Only a year?

[Laanem] Not more, I think, since they are reorienting themselves fairly rapidly.

[Razmislyavichyute] Urmas, what do you believe in?

[Laanem] In the future. Is that banal? What it will be like is another matter. I believe that the empire is collapsing. In general, it is very hard to live without hope. I think that an absolute understanding of each other will prevail, for otherwise our life and our work stand for nothing. For instance, the Komsomol as an organization is perceived as equal to zero in our republic. On the other hand, many do not imagine what can be done. Talking to a colleague from Leningrad, I said that probably the most annoying thing is being a "political corpse:" if you do not make radical decisions, then that is exactly what you are, like it or not. I do not know how it is with yours, but our Komsomol and its structure are unacceptable. Here, evidently, it is a matter of historical memory: it does not permit delving deeply into that which we are working on now—I am referring to the Central Committee apparatus. The farce that took place 10-15 years ago was not forgotten.

[Razmislyavichyute] Excuse me, but have you been working as first secretary for long?

[Laanem] Oh, a long time... 8 months already! Youth has supported me and, they say, will support me. However, the process of restructuring is so complex that some young people have lost faith and, for instance, rebuked me at our Komsomol plenum, asking why I had not been frank with them half a year ago and did not say what I said on 18 May. I openly admit: half a year ago I myself did not know what we wanted and where we were going.

[Razmislyavichyute] Tell me, are you a bit envious that we are meeting in a congress now?

[Laanem] No. We raised a similar question in December. I can now say that it was a very sensible decision, that we did not set a date for a congress at that time. If we had done this, then a congress similar to yours, since our processes are adequate in practice, would have been held in May. However, such a congress does not satisfy us. It

seems, it does not satisfy you either. The concepts of an "independent Komsomol," "our own organization," "our own statutes," and so on, are also yesterday's. Today we are striving for depth; I am sure that sooner or later it will be necessary to change the structure essentially, and not rely on the already mentioned concepts. They can no longer save the organization, and really just preserve it for a little while, suspending the collapse. Such is the specific nature of the Baltic area. We are questioning and seeking an answer: just what is communist, and why? Agreed, right now you, perhaps, are half a step ahead of us, but I cannot help but doubt: maybe, after our own congress, we will be a whole step ahead of you?

[Razmislyavichyute] Are you a bold person by nature?

[Laanem] One ought to be bold. I was thinking this today, when it was necessary to vote for the resolution on the Georgian events. This formulation of the problem, I realized, is an adventure, for they do not understand us.

[Razmislyavichyute] Does that mean that it should not have been proposed in general?

[Laanem] It should have been. Mandatorily. The hall was not especially troubled by what had happened in Georgia. One or two such sittings later, maybe, they will start thinking. If we want to be called a political organization, we ought to evaluate political moments and the situation. But now? It means that the political situation is only a fantasy, and not reality.

[Razmislyavichyute] I hope that we will meet at the Lithuanian Komsomol Congress. What would you say, if you had the floor?

[Laanem] I would say that the goal is not to restore a youth organization, but to search for an optimal solution, so that young people will be able to choose. There should be a diversity of choice, for, if there is no diversity, there is no action. In short, there should be more youth organizations, which would prove in competition who is right, and who is not.

First Secretary of Latvian Komsomol

18001417 Vilnius KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 89 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Ivars Preditis, first secretary, Latvian Komsomol Central Committee, by R. Razmislyavichyute: "Seen Far Away, Unheard Nearby"]

[Razmislyavichyute] On the eve of the plenum, when the conference for our so-called zone was held, you fairly actively and categorically reproached us: one can only ask, you said, so many questions, without receiving answers to them. Yet, today you were not like that... Do you think that only a small and narrow audience is in a condition to understand? Is it because you think thus, that you are a member of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Buro?

[Preditis] I think the situation is far simpler. When meaningless conversations are being held, I try to not get involved. I planned to say, I planned—already I am going... However, in principle that which I wanted to say was said: they proposed convening an All-Union Komsomol congress, although I do not think that it will solve anything, and they doubted the Law on Youth. It was also impossible to say more, to understand more, to decide more right now. You now, in an unrefined, unstructured society, which has not clarified its own past, never mind its future, a youth organization with an ideological basis is impossible. There are no ideas. What are we creating? Where are we going?

[Razmislyavichyute] Well, what is your attitude toward the step by the Lithuanian youth, or more precisely, Komsomol?

[Preditis] I think that the Komsomol congress is too early. Although one would be most mistaken to believe that I am right. Nobody knows how it should be done. We have a different situation: you have 80 percent Lithuanians. We must still seek methods that would unite youth. For the time being, I do not see these methods or a general idea. After half a year, I think, it will be possible to say more than now.

We do not well and truly know what youth wants. Agreed, you have hit on a ten, that is, you sensed the time, but have you grasped the idea? Time "burns out," but later? There is nothing terrible, properly speaking, about convening yet another congress after a year. Why not?

[Razmislyavichyute] Does this seem like a game?

[Preditis] All our life is a game.

[Razmislyavichyute] Are you an optimist?

[Preditis] Yes.

[Razmislyavichyute] What does the youth of Latvia expect?

[Preditis] I believe in success. Every day I worry: how much am I helping the organization, whether I am becoming a hindrance to it, whether I serve as... peat, that they toss in order to extinguish a fire?

[Razmislyavichyute] When does your work day begin and end?

[Preditis] Usually from 8:30 to 21:00.

[Razmislyavichyute] Do you think this is normal?

[Preditis] Such is reality. I am anxious that I do not always succeed with humanitarian, common human things. Reading documents and the press swallow up time, yet it seems to me that, without literature, newspaper information does not form basic concepts.

[Razmislyavichyute] What is your specialization?

[Preditis] A promising education: I am an engineer-systems technician. Every day I regret that I am forgetting my training. On the other hand, it is impossible to say that I regret having become secretary. Being "at the top," I see a great deal, I have found out a great deal, and I have accumulated experience. However, I must admit that it is difficult for me to find a common language with today's youth. This is already a different generation, and I directly, humanly, cannot sense the right to be with them in one organization. I do not thoroughly understand them, and they feel this. I am not their representative. I have the same feeling, as though I were a father-instructor. Yet, it should be a youth organization, and young people should solve their own problems, even while making mistakes.

[Razmislyavichyute] I asked your colleague Urmas what he would say at the Lithuanian Komsomol congress. How would you answer this question?

[Preditis] I have already thought of what I would say at the congress. I even imagined that I would say the first phrases... in Lithuanian. After all, we are brothers in terms of fate. If our fate is common, then our youth organizations should look for points of contiguity. We will find strength only in unity. Youth organizations should be the bearers and voices of common human ideas. Only then will young people come.

Interethnic Cooperation in Greens' Cleanup Action

19001447a Vilnius KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jul 89 p 1

[Article by A. Gintautyte: "A 'Sweet-Smelling' Journey: First Impressions of the Peace March from Vilnius to Klajpeda"]

[Text] We all knew that Vilnius was a beautiful, green city and that a bend of the Neris River beautifies it a great deal. Well then, it would remain green and beautiful, it would still be beautified, in fact, by this bend, if, boasting about the fact that we are realists, remained realists. Alas.... Such a realist has not yet been born.... From 1300 to 1900 hours on Saturday our inflated rafts, kayaks, canoes, and boats sailed from the Zhirmunskiy Bridge to the water-purification facilities. Some persons sailed along the river itself, while others walked along the bank, gathering trash as they went. Various odors arose and were perceived. Scarcely had we stepped into the water when we hurried back to the bank. mud, but where could we wash it off? The poor inhabitants of Vilnius, who do not have vacations and those who have no place to go fish, swim, and tan themselves here. Let's call them risk-takers. But it was difficult for those participating in the march. No, don't think that they became tourists, meeting from time to time in order to enjoy themselves. Nor was there anything easy when they reached the first encampment—near the purification facilities with all their odors and cheerless structures.

The march had begun on Friday with a meeting in Nagorni Park. I may be mistaken, and maybe it really is time to stop talking. It seemed to us journalists that the persons assembled there were paying more attention to the singers V. Kyarnagis, V. Stakenas, R. Paulauskas, and A. Dolskiy than to the speakers. More and more marches of various types are being conducted through Lithuania (we have counted at least 9), but fewer and fewer people are participating in them. That is natural. Those who took part in the march to Grigishkes on Sunday were met calmly. You could walk around this small town and not suspect that a meeting was being held on the bank of the Neris, right opposite the Grigishkes Production Association. Did the inhabitants of Grigishkes know everything? Evidently, they did, inasmuch as it was only the participants in the march who gathered around A. Narbutas, the association's chief engineer. Right alongside was P. Sakalauskas, the deputy chairman of the Vilnius City Committee for Safeguarding Nature. On Saturday we inspected the purification facilities; our guide here was A. Makauskas, chief of the water pipeline and sewerage system. The same old questions, the same old problem—how to preserve the Neris. The Grigishkes Association, which has been subjected to penalties on more than one occasion, is seeking a solution. Will it find one? On its own, it lacks the capability of building purification facilities. It could have been, if 8 million rubles had not been handed over to the Vilnius Purification Facilities. In short, it is a kind of closed circle.

The participants in this march include "Greens" from Georgia, the Ukraine, Latvia, and Belorussia. The Neris flows to us from Belorussia, and, unfortunately, it is much dirtier and narrower than we would like.

Today the participants in the march are en route in Kyarnava. Yesterday, not far from Mayshyagala, in the village of Paneryay, they listened to jazz, and, in the evening in Kyarnava—they listened to some choral songs. Those persons who were not too lazy joined in. But the main even is still ahead. I heard on the radio yesterday that people have already made preparations to picket in Kedaynyay—the local ispolkom supports the "Greens'" desire to picket the military airfield. Friday is a special day. There will be a meeting in Ionava at the Azot Production Association, followed only slightly later by a meeting in Kedaynyay at or near the military airfield. The march has really just begun, and it is too early to make any profound summations or conclusions. But we plan on drawing scientifically based, sound conclusions when the march itself has concluded.

Young Lithuanians from Abroad Participate in Congress

18001447b Vilnius KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jul 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Young People Assemble"]

[Text] On 14 July approximately 500 of our fellow-Lithuanians will arrive from various corners of the

USSR and from foreign countries in order to take part in the World Lithuanian Youth Days. This event, which will continue until 23 July, has been organized by the Lituania Lithuanian Youth Society.

Audris Antanaytis, deputy chairman of its organizational committee and a member of the Lituania Society's Council, talked to ELTA correspondent D. Bilotyte in more detail about this youth festival:

"Nowadays, when Lithuania is flinging open a window on the world more and more widely, an opportunity has appeared to meet young Lithuanians scattered in far-off regions. Not to meet somewhere in the West, as was done up to now, but in the land of their fathers and grandfathers. That's the way it should be, as the motto of the Lituania Society proclaims, the Lithuanian people, like any people in the world, are integrated and indivisible.

But the time should not drag for those who come to their native land. The opening of the festival will be in Vilnius; it is planned to hold many interesting meetings with prominent figures in science, culture, and the arts; discussions will be conducted on Lithuania's history and its present-day situation. Excursions will be organized around Lithuania's capital, as well as Kaunas, Rumshishkes, and Trakay. By the way, some jolly events await our guests in Kaunas—basketball games. This city will also be the site of an aviation festival, interesting concerts, and general get-togethers. Together with our guests, we will mark the anniversary of the Grunewald Battle, as well as the flight of Daryus and Girenas. The participants in Youth Day will visit the theological seminary in Kaunas, take part in ethnographic lessons and improvised concerts, and see shows by this republic's theaters. An important feature of the festival will be the forums to be organized by the Lituania Society. The program also has one labor action: we will all take part in the procedure of the Trakay Peninsula.

The sponsors of the World Youth Day include about 20 plants and cooperatives of this republic. Certain individuals are also helping with the work, funds, transportation, and organization of this festival.

Sajudis Chairman Visits Bonn

18001445a Vilnius KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 89 p 4

[Unattributed report: "On the Eve of the Anniversary—Nothing New..."]

[Text] Vitautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Seym Council of the Lithuanian Movement for Restructuring, Sajudis, and his wife Grazhina visited the FRG and then traveled to the United States. It was here that they granted an interview to Romas Sakadolskis, a correspondent of the Voice of America. During the interview a great deal of attention was paid to the viewpoint of the West German authorities with regard to the approaching anniversary of the Hitler-Stalin agreements. In the FRG V. Landsbergis succeeded in meeting with Doctor Hans

Sterkner, chairman of the Bundestag's Commission on Foreign Affairs. Their meeting lasted for almost two hours. We think that certain aspects of the conversation with V. Landsbergis would be of interest to our readers.

"The conversation revolved primarily around the approach anniversary of the Hitler-Stalin agreements, about what is being done with regard to this matter in the Soviet Union, what kinds of demands are being made by the Baltic states, and how they are being evaluated by West Germany. Doctor H. Sterken reiterated and emphasized his own personal, favorable inclination in this matter, but he also stressed that the West German government was not inclined to exacerbate its relations with the Soviet Union by any sorts of declarations. The Bundestag has no commission which is analogous to the one established in Moscow. It evidently seems to them that such a commission is unnecessary because West Germany, both the parliament and the government, have emphasized on more than one occasion their own attitude toward the so-called Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, deeming it illegal. And it was only at my expressed wish that they promised to assemble these declarations and sum them up in a certain sense. Then it could be seen, in fact, of what nature they are: whether or not this whole matter is exhausted by this and does not require some special declaration. It is understood that a denial or a non-denial of this fact does not alter at all the de jure status of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, which is known. Because the agreement in the pact itself—whether this is declared for all to hear or not—is illegal. It is an agreement of two powers at the expense of a third.

To the correspondent's question concerning the FRG's present-day responsibility for the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and the consequences of World War II, as well as specific steps possible, Professor V. Landsbergis replied as follows:

"One specific possibility—that of a political declaration addressed to the Soviet Union—was raised, but the reply was that there would be no such declaration (this refers to a declaration in connection with the anniversary of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact.—**Editor's Note**). If the West German government were to make such a special declaration, could it include a proposal to the Soviet Union to abrogate the consequences of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact relative to the three Baltic states? The reply was essentially negative: such a declaration would be understood as purely declarative and could possibly even be interpreted as an attack against the Soviet Union, and, therefore, there will be no such declaration.

Greens' Parliament Meets

18001445b Vilnius KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 89 p 4

[Article by Yu. Dautartas: "Parliament on the Grass"]

[Text] The first meeting of the Lithuanian Greens' parliament took place outdoors in Lazdenay.

At first people who had traveled there from all corners of the republic were listened to. People spoke about the expansion of the Mezheykskiy Oil Refinery, about picketing enterprises engaged in exporting petroleum products at Klaypeda, and about many other problems. Those persons who had assembled here were informed about the work done by the organizational group which founded the party of the Lithuanian Greens. Also discussed here was propagandizing the activity of the Greens. And a discussion took place concerning the weekly publication ZALOJI LIETUVA.

The meeting heard an announcement by Saulius Gritsyus about the Peace March which will take place on 7—16 July; everyone was invited to participate in it. Representatives of the Shyaulay Club for Safeguarding Nature and the Aukuras Monuments disseminated a declaration entitled "Problems of Preserving and Establishing Scenic Areas in Lithuania."

Serious criticism was leveled at the organizers of this meeting of the parliament. It was remarked that the parliament of the Greens should not engage in discussions—this takes up a great deal of time. What it ought to do is to listen to previously prepared reports and, in case of necessity, adopt specific measures.

Greens Announce Antimilitarist March

18001445c Vilnius KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 89 p 4

[Unattributed report: "Protest March To Begin"]

[Text] Tomorrow, Friday, 7 July marks the beginning of the Peace March through Lithuania. This is the second ecological and antimilitarist protest march which has been conducted by the Atgaya Kaunas Society of Greens and the Kaunas Youth Center.

Everyone is invited on 7 July to Nagorniy Park, where the march's first event will be held—a meeting to sing protest songs.

Participants will include the poet Kyastutis Gyanis, the following songwriters and performers: Vitautas Kyariagis, Virgis Stakenas, Rolandas Paulauskas (Lithuania), Aleksandr Dolskiy (Leningrad), and the Park Way group (Warsaw). Speaking here will be public and cultural figures, as well as representatives of the Lithuanian Greens and Sajudis. The program will begin at 2000 hours. Admission is free.

Those persons intending to participate in the march are requested to stop in at the participants' camp, which will be set up not far from the site of the event mentioned above.

Lithuanian Parents Concerned About Military Draft

18001446 Vilnius KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jul 89 pp 1, 3

[Article by Col K. Golubev, chief of the Political Department of the Lithuanian SSR Military Commissariat: "What the Draft Showed"]

[Text] The scheduled draft into the USSR Armed Forces has concluded. It took place in a rather unusual situation this year. Questions of military service are being widely discussed by the public. Whereas before young men completely trusted the decision of the draft boards, today they have become increasingly concerned about where they will be stationed and whether they will be stationed with fellow countrymen.

Of course, among both the draftees and parents there are still many who are displeased with the fact that some of the young men have been sent to serve outside the republic and the Baltic Military District. Alas, such is the situation today. It was explained in an address by USSR Minister of Defense D. Yazov at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 3 July of this year and in an address by the republic's military commissar, A. Visotskis, on 5 July at the session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

On the whole, the draft was conducted in an organized manner; the absolute majority of the young men had a respectful attitude toward observance of the article of the Constitution and Lithuanian SSR Law on fulfilling their duty to protect the fatherland. The young men appeared at the draft points in a timely manner and were disciplined.

For many years there existed an anti-humane procedure of keeping the draftees behind closed doors at the induction center—isolated from the masses. Only democratization of public life, including in military issues, has made it possible to break out-of-date stereotypes.

This is already the third draft that the republic induction center has been open for parents, relatives, close friends, and guests. It has become more difficult to work, but to make up for it, another zone of absurd prohibitions has been eliminated. And nothing terrible has happened. They have begun to trust us more, and parents are more at ease with the way of life of their sons at the induction center.

Conditions have been created for the lads. A dining hall with a wide assortment of food, a cafe, a newspaper stand, and a movie hall are in operation. Concerts were organized. Taking advantage of the opportunity, I wish to thank the republic's Ministry of Culture. The creative collectives of the Music School imeni Tallat-Kyalpshi, under the direction of R. Milashyus, the "Trimitas"

brass band, and the performances of the "Pankration" center of military-sports single combat were a hit with the lads.

Col (Res) V. Ragauskas, veteran of the 16th Lithuanian Division, talked with the draftees in a non-typical manner, affably, and earnestly.

There were also problems. The Komsomol kept itself aloof from working with the young people. At the induction center, the lads saw the youth leaders only in the presidium at festivities, but during the regular routine, alas, no one came to them or said kind parting words. The Vilnius Gorispolkom Movie Department actually disrupted the showing of movies for the draftees. But a solution was found—they enlisted the help of a movie specialist from a military unit.

There were anxious and uneasy moments. Among the guest there were considerably more young people in a drunken state, and attempts were made to pass alcohol to the draftees. There were instances where draftees collected money for vodka and sent a "messenger" to the "point." Thus, draftee V. Danilov from Klaypeda collected 138 rubles, purchased 12 bottles of vodka, and brought them to the induction center. The drinking bout was prevented by steps taken, and the money was returned to the "shareholders"—R. Stabingis, S. Poshkas, R. Barauskas, A. Pyatkyavichyus, R. Rybachenko, and R. Povilaytis—after a reprimand. I do not think it is necessary to talk about the consequences that could have resulted from a drinking bout by the draftees.

I am surprised by the unconcern of compassionate parents who hand over as much as 100 rubles to their son. Why? Their son is at the induction center for 2-3 days, longer in exceptional cases, when a special flight is delayed due to weather conditions. We give them money for food. The draftee still needs money for additional food, sweets, newspapers, and magazines. The movies and concerts are free.

Apparently, many are interested in whether there were those who evaded the draft. There were, and I would especially like to talk about this. Thirteen young men "evaded" the spring draft on various pretexts: Zh. Babulis from Varena; D. Grigaytis from Kaunas; P. Gauslis from Gargzhday; L. Pyatravchyus from Raseynay; V. Bulavka and R. Ryameykis from Ukmerge; A. Mitkus from Shyauliyay; K. Kastigovas from Utena; N. Shipshinskas from Panevezhis; and E. Adomonis, M. Chekhun, G. Ratauskas, and A. Patilskis from Vilnius. They all will have to answer to the law.

Parents have many questions concerning their sons' first days of service. In particular, why are there no letters, they are probably being beaten and that is why they are silent, or roughly of this nature. I understand parents' concern. All the more so, having heard a lot about the negative phenomena in the Army, everyone imagines that from the first day their son has become the object of

harassment and humiliation, and any extended silence is regarded as a result of relations that are at variance with regulations.

We, in turn, begin to look for the reason, make telephone calls, send telegrams to all echelons, and are happy when we are convinced that everything is fine with the lad.

The draftees do not always like this, and their reactions differ. The other day I received a telegram from G. Mikalauskas of Dzhambul. He wrote: "I am fine and feel very well in the Army. I ask you, please, not to bother the detachment command any more." Similar letters were received from N. Amanavichyus and A. Bruzhas of Khabarovsk Kray, R. Burzdzyus of Kalinin, and others.

The military commissariats ties with parents have become closer, and the results more productive. During the second quarter of this year alone we received 236 parents of draftees and got 346 letters; this is 39 percent more than last year.

I am very grateful to V. Zhilinskayta and D. Taraylena, members of the Military Service Affairs Commission of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, and Ye. Kubilena and R. Paurayta, members of the organizing committee of the Alliance of Women of Lithuania. We have worked up a procedure for reviewing complaints and statements, and operate efficiently and harmoniously. Thus, at our request, privates A. Nautskunas, G. Karpavichyus, and A. Ivanauskas, toward whom relations took place that were at variance with regulations, were transferred to a different military unit. This is just one of the forms of work which has emerged as a result of perestroika and proved its worth under today's conditions.

Not long ago, lads who had completed their service in the USSR Armed Forces returned home. Now they are facing problems with finding work; many of them will enroll in VUZes. I have a great favor to ask of the leaders on whom the fate of yesterday's soldiers depends: Assist them and accept them into your collectives cordially and with fatherly warmth.

The summer is short-lived, fall will come, and it will again be bustling at the republic induction center. We will be happy if the issues associated with the service of the sons of Lithuania being examined at the session of the republic Supreme Soviet are resolved before fall.

Your children—they are also our children, and their fate is by no means inconsequential to us. Emotions and a preconceived attitude toward us are not always justified. In the future we expect help from the public in order to bring up your sons to be courageous, strong in body and spirit, and true patriots.

Estonia Simplifies Procedures for Business Trips Abroad

18001400 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 8 Jul 89 p 3

[Article by G. Logunov: "On the Simplification of Procedures for Business Travel Abroad"]

[Text] The republic's government, or rather the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers Presidium, issued a decree on 7 July, 1989 which will regulate rules concerning business trips abroad. What is the new procedure for officially registering to go abroad on business?

First, the official registration for business trips to socialist countries differs from the registration procedure to visit capitalist and developing nations.

When business travel to a socialist country is necessary, the directorship of any republic organization (which has the status of a juristic person) is authorized to send its workers on business trips. In order to arrange a business trip it suffices to reach an agreement with the receiving end as to the goal, length of stay, financial and other conditions specified by the Estonian SSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, where passports are issued for trips abroad. Having acquired tickets and exchanged money, one is allowed to depart.

Now a word about business trips to capitalist and developing countries. In contrast to trips to socialist countries, the decisions about these trips are made by high-level directors, namely the directorship of a ministry, a state committee, a department, a central (public) organization (whose constitution is registered with the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium or with the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers), enterprises under joint ownership with foreign firms, and also associations as well as enterprises and organizations under Union jurisdiction (the latter must receive approval by their ministry). Exactly the same authority is held by directors of city and rayon executive committees, which make decisions about the business trips made not only by co-workers of their own apparatus, but also by workers in cooperatives which are registered in their territories.

It is clear that business travel abroad by a specialist who is privy to government secrets is attended by the risk that information that should not be made public will be leaked. Therefore full responsibility for preparing the specialist for the business trip lies with the director who decides to send him abroad. The director is obliged to request a report every five years on the access a specialist who has traveled abroad to capitalist or developing nations has had to confidential information. This kind of information is made available by state security bodies not later than 20 days after an inquiry. This information is neither "permission" nor a "prohibition"; it is taken into consideration by a director sending a specialist abroad.

Permission has been granted for repeated trips within a five-year period to capitalist and developing countries by specialists who, owing to specifics of their work and the position they hold, must regularly travel abroad on business.

There is an additional hurdle to be cleared before traveling to capitalist and developing countries. Paperwork for the necessary passport differs from that for travel in socialist countries in that the organization sending a specialist abroad must itself become actively involved in the application for a (usually 20-day) visa. The permanent representation [postpredstvo] of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers in Moscow should render assistance with visa applications.

All remarks on business trips to capitalist and developing countries apply as well to trips abroad by ship.

What should be said about this governmental decree?

If we recall the cumbersome system of paperwork for business trips abroad which was still in existence a couple of years ago, then this is certainly a progressive decision. Before it was necessary to complete in several copies autobiographies, forms, character references, certificates of objective, and lists of specialists. It was necessary to go through the republic's party and economic organs and then to do the same on a Union level. It is no wonder that it took about one-half year from the time of registration to the time of departure. Now everything is decided locally and without involving party organs. Of the required forms, only the certificate of objective remains, and that is submitted in one copy and only every five years.

It is clear that in this case the resolution of the CPSU 19th All-Union Conference on limiting the functions of party and government organs is being put into practice and that the USSR is fulfilling its commitment which originates with the concluding document of the Geneva meeting of nations participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The system for registering to go abroad which existed until now represented the clearest result of the administrative-command period of our society.

However, even the decree which was issued cannot be called sufficiently radical, and this is the case because the system of management by orders and decrees and of departmental ambition continues to let its presence be known. Otherwise how can we talk about the self-sufficiency of financially autonomous enterprises which are operating on the basis of the USSR law "On Government Enterprises (and Associations)," if the decisions about business trips to capitalist and developing nations take place on the level of the corresponding ministry? The decree clearly states that all expenditures connected with the registration of passports for travel abroad and of other travel documents, as payment for the stamp duty as well as for business travel and other expenses in both Soviet and foreign currency, are the full responsibility of the organization sponsoring the trip. Therefore why

should someone decide for these organizations the fate of business trips abroad made by their specialists? It would seem that the organizations themselves which send their specialists abroad should also be able make decisions about trips to capitalist and developing countries.

It should not be supposed that supervising an enterprise from above adds anything except for wasted time and extra work. And such a situation often makes parasites of the higher authorities, as when they include their "specialists" in delegations from subordinate enterprises. It is also clear that when a decision is made by higher authorities, the responsibility for possible violations of laws falls upon the high-level directors who have made the decision. This often leads to more excessively cautious behavior and the rejection of requests to travel on business.

I would like to remark once more upon the clearly progressive role of this decree, without which the package of laws on economic accountability [khozraschet] in the republic would of course be incomplete.

LaSSR Economic Autonomy Plan Criticized

Goals Linked to National Ideology

18200430 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
12 Jul 89 p 2

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Malinkovskiy: "A Shortage of Responsibility—Discussing the Drafts of Republic Laws"]

[Text] The draft of the law "The Economic Independence of the LaSSR" that was published for discussion and developed on the basis of the Concepts of Economic Independence of the Latvian SSR emphasizes that "economic activity should provide for the preservation of the basic nation on its historical territory."

Is the terminology "basic nation" correct? Representatives of 130 nationalities live in the Latvian SSR. Latvians comprise roughly 50 percent of the overall population of the republic. Their proportionate share of the sectors of material production in 1987 was 38.1 percent in industry and construction, 33.8 in transport and 45.3 in housing and municipal and consumer services. The share of the Latvian ethnic group was 80-84 percent only in the timber and farming industries, which comprise some 16 percent of those employed in the national economy.¹ The number of Latvians employed at enterprises and organizations of the republic totaled 571,800 people, or 47.6 percent of the overall number of manual and office workers.

It can be seen from the statistical data that individuals of the indigenous nationality do not even comprise a relative majority in a large portion of the sectors of material production, and consequently they do not produce the principal portion of either the aggregate social product or national income.

The proportionate share of Latvians employed in non-productive sectors is high at the same time. They comprised 74.6 percent in culture and the arts, 58.8 in elementary education and 53.4 percent in health care, physical fitness and social security in 1987.² Their proportionate share in administration is even higher. They are 77 percent of the chairmen of rayon and city ispolkoms, 83 percent of ministers and chairmen of the state committees of the republic, 65 percent of the Council of Ministers apparatus, 79 percent of the directors of sovkhozes and 88 percent of the chairmen of kolkhozes.³

And what is the number of individuals of the Latvian nationality in the nationality composition of the republic party organization? They were 39.7 percent according to data for 1 January 1988, as well as 62.3 percent among the secretaries of primary party organizations, 80 percent of the central committee secretaries and 65.2 percent of the employees of rayon and city party committees.⁴

Representatives of the Latvian ethnic group, as can be seen, occupy a leading position both in the system of party, state and economic leadership and in administration.

It is thus essential to be principled and consistent. While completely justifiably criticizing the ideology of the "older brother," we cannot replace it with the ideology of the "basic nation," otherwise one could suspect the authors of the draft law on economic independence for the republic of something very non-ethnic in nature.

The draft law speaks of "preserving the basic nation on its historical territory." Does anyone really want to eliminate the Latvian ethnic group? Of course not: we should not extend the Stalinist deformations of socialism to the current policies of the CPSU. One furthermore cannot equate republic and ethnic territories. Not one of the union or autonomous republics of the USSR coincides completely in a territorial fashion with the origin, development and historical or contemporary settlement of this or that ethnic group. Such an equation is fraught with serious theoretical misunderstandings and national and political conflict.

If we equate territories with ethnic groups, then we will have to acknowledge that all of the Baltic area is excluded from the ethnic territory of the Slavic peoples, while Bukhara and Samarkand are not part of the ethnic territory of the Tajiks. The fact that these peoples have their own nation-state formations cannot be an argument in favor of such an equation, otherwise it obtains that the Tajiks of Uzbekistan or the Belorussians of Latvia are doomed to worse conditions of ethno-cultural development just because they live outside the boundaries of their own republics. And what about the peoples who do not have autonomy at all (the gypsies, for example)? There is consequently no place and no need for them to reproduce?

It is impossible to lump together relations between all-union territories and republics that are polyethnic in population composition with peoples and ethnic groups. This circumstance is not always taken into account or realized. National relations are usually understood at the level of everyday consciousness first and foremost as relations among republics. This is disorienting in analyzing nationality problems and, aside from everything else, makes it possible for those who want to pass off exclusively nationality-based interests as the interests of the whole republic and to claim privileged rights for the people for whom the republic is named. There can only be one result—an imbalance of interests and growth in tensions among nationalities.

It should be stated in summing up that two questions are being clearly delineated among the whole set of national and political problems of Soviet society: the question of relations among republics, i.e., effectively among states, and the question of relations among nationalities—the relations among the peoples of the country. Keeping in mind that the USSR was created according to national-territorial features, we must solve not one but two problems: the problem of improving the Soviet federation and the problem of regulating relations among nationalities. There is unfortunately in essence one idea that threads through the whole draft of the law "The Economic Independence of the LaSSR": not what to undertake to strengthen the federation, but only how to create confederative economic relations. Activity that contradicts this approach, the draft law emphasizes, will be curtailed with the aid of economic and legal measures.

Confederative economic relations were most fully reflected in the Concepts of Economic Independence of the Latvian SSR that were published in June of this year.⁵

We turn to history in order to uncover how the process of devising these concepts transpired.

There was an expanded plenum of the Latvian Communist Party Board in June of 1988. The resolution emphasized that "there is concern that national riches, and first and foremost natural riches, be used in the interests of the indigenous population."⁶ It turns out that almost 1 million people of the population of the republic are deprived of the right to make use of the national wealth created by their own hands in their own interests.

This approach was consolidated in the program of the Popular Front of Latvia, which indicates that its activity is founded on the principles of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the resolutions of the June (1988) Plenum of the LaSSR Writers' Union.⁷

The 9th Session of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet narrowed the problem even more—it moved from the indigenous population to the indigenous nation: "Whatever questions we may discuss, the point of departure for their resolution should be the interests of the indigenous nation."⁸ This signifies that in the resolution of any

questions, the interests of 1.3 million people of the republic will now not be taken into account.

The manifestation of regional egotism was subsequently expressed in strict restrictions on postal, railroad and air departures outside the boundaries of the republic⁹ and unjustified forms of prohibitions on population migration instead of its efficient regulation.

All of this could lead to a rift in the objective ties of the republic with regions, while they should know to value those ties; after all, the delivery of material assets into the republic in 1987 totaled some 6 billion rubles, or 35 percent of the production volume of the gross social product.¹⁰ Such activity could lead to irregularities in deliveries and be a blow to the standard of living of all ethnic groups living in the republic.

The materials from a conference of specialists from the Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian SSRs that was held in Riga on 21-23 September 1988 to develop a new model of socio-economic development were fundamental to an understanding of the extant political situation in the republic. Taking part in the work of this conference were Latvian CP Buro member V. Bresis, Central Committee Secretary and Buro member J. Okherin and Central Committee member and republic Gosplan Chairman M. Raman. The results of the conference were reflected in the coordinated fundamental principles of republic economic accountability [*khozraschet*] that were signed by M. Raman in the name of the Latvian SSR.

The founding congress of the Popular Front of Latvia [PFL] that was held in October 1988 emphasized in its Resolution No. 4 on Economic Sovereignty that in the "ultimate development of a model of socio-economic development for Latvia, we must rely on the basic principles of republic economic accountability that were coordinated and introduced in the minutes of the conference of 21-23 September 1988."¹¹

A merging of official economic policy with the ideology of the PFL thereby occurred on the basis of the coordinated principles of republic economic accountability.

On the basis of what doctrinal provisions did this merging take place? First of all, on the recognition of republic ownership that is economically and legally separate from the ownership of other union republics; second, on the pursuit of an independent internal and external economic policy for the republic, which conducts its activity in mutual relations with the other union republics on an equivalent basis; and third, on the introduction of their own currency.

This supporting framework of republic economic accountability is at its foundation an attempt to break up the Soviet federation and move to confederative relations within the composition of the USSR.

Foundation of Plan Called 'Shaky'

18200430 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
13 Jul 89 p 2

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Malinkovskiy: "A Shortage of Responsibility—Discussing the Drafts of Republic Laws"]

[Text] The problem of the interconnection of union republics and the center is being widely discussed in the press today. There basically exist two polar viewpoints. One of them consists of the recognition of the necessity of a redistribution of state authority in such a way that the union republics could themselves implement the whole range of state power on "their own" territory. This point of view also includes the provision that a state cannot be deemed sovereign if it cannot manage independently its territory and resources. This point of view can be reduced in brief to the recognition of the union republic as primary and the federation as secondary and derivative. The other viewpoint consists of the recognition of the whole range of state authority for the federation and the same completeness in the disposal of resources.

The first viewpoint is considered by its authors to be a considered and genuinely revolutionary one corresponding to the letter and spirit of restructuring. The second viewpoint, in their opinion, is the yesterday of our federation.

Both points of view are incorrect in an academic regard. The elements of ties on the methodological plane are being ignored here. And in reality the general features of the whole (federation) are not reduced to the general features of the parts (the union republics and the center) that comprise that whole. They become parts (center and republics) of an organism (such as the socialist federation is), Hegel said, in the hands of the pathoanatomist, but in that case we are dealing not with a living organism, but with corpses. The organism—as F. Engels loved to repeat—is alive and thereby differs from its parts, which cannot live. We must not focus our attention on some single aspect—the center or the republics—but rather on an understanding of providing for their dialectical unity. An understanding of the fact that without reinforcing the inseparability of their ties, both the sovereign center and the sovereign socialist republic will disappear and the disintegration of the USSR will occur.

Is it possible to envisage all aspects of this unity in agreements concluded by each union republic with the center? Obviously not. Life is much more dynamic than any agreement. The discussion thus objectively concerns the more precise delimitation of authority between the union republics and the center, the greater imbuing of each republic with sovereign rights and the greater imbuing of the center with sovereign rights. The socialist federation can further develop today only thus. The assertions of some authors who consider themselves experts in the realm of law that the "sovereignty of the republic either exists or it does not" thus illustrate very

well a lack of understanding of dialectics on their part. One cannot employ the framework of international law in describing a new type of relations that were unknown in practice before, namely a socialist polynational federation.

The imbuing of the center with sovereign rights today will proceed in the direction of devising a unified foreign policy with its multitude of aspects; defining the strategic course of economic development; formulating unified technical policy; determining the intensiveness and synchronization of the implementation of interconnected political and economic reforms; and, determining ways of developing the social division of labor and the unified nationwide market.

The imbuing of each union republic with sovereign rights at this stage will be accomplished along the lines of developing comprehensively the economy of the republic; reinforcing the social sphere for resolving on the spot all problems associated with satisfying the needs of the population and shifting many functions from the center to the local administration in this regard; and, delineating precisely both the income and the expenses of the republic and all-union budgets—the consolidation of sources of income, etc.

We return to the model of republic economic accountability. The creation of republic ownership via transfer from the Union to the republic is being declared. The authors of the concepts are making a gross error in equating ownership with property. Ownership is not a thing, K. Marx emphasized, but rather social relations that arise among people on the score of the acquisition of things. The acquisition of things is moreover not a legal term. The monkey also “acquires” a banana by knocking it off with a stick. The acquisition of things includes their production, distribution, exchange and consumption. In order to coordinate and bring order to these processes under the conditions of labor cooperation, they must be administered—disposal, possession, use. Administration is thus a function of ownership herein that can be accomplished by the subject of the ownership or transferred to others, lessees for example. The implementation of ownership that proceeds from Stalin’s work “Dialectical and Historical Materialism” has apparently become thoroughly solidified in the educational process of the minds of the authors of these concepts with the force of preconviction, which has naturally not permitted them to approach the fulfillment of their task in strictly scientific fashion.

The appearance of this or that form of ownership is conditioned by the nature of collectivization of production. Marx and Engels clearly delineated two types of collectivization: economic and administrative-compulsory. The former is founded on a deepening of the division of labor. The latter is based on the willful directive nationalization of production. F. Engels called it Bismark-like, unable to accelerate the development of production. On the contrary, it turns into a serious impediment to it.

Many of our misfortunes today began namely with the fact that Stalin vulgarized Marxist teaching on the two types of collectivization, taking any nationalization of ownership to be its collectivization. The view that collectivization could be achieved by purely willful means ultimately prevailed soon after the death of Lenin. The authors of the basic principles of republic economic accountability, in declaring the creation of republic ownership, have evidently not thought about the question of whether the level of actual collectivization of production corresponds to the boundaries of the republic, is less than them or, on the contrary, passes through the borders of the republic.

It is namely the differing levels of actual and real collectivization of production that explain the existence of the statewide social ownership as a system of economic relations operating across the whole territory of the USSR. The actual level of production collectivization at the same time gives rise to a variety of forms of socialist ownership: the ownership of labor collectives in the state sector of production, or cooperative, municipal or individual ownership. There is no republic ownership among them, as we see, since a level of production collectivization that would be self-contained at the republic level does not exist. An illustration of this are the objectively necessarily diversified ties of our republics with other republics in the unified national-economic system of the USSR. The Latvian SSR thus imports (in percentage of consumption) 48 percent and exports (in percentage of production) 44 percent of the volume of industrial output.¹²

The authors of the basic principles of republic economic accountability, the Concepts and the Law on Economic Independence are at least 40 years late in proclaiming republic ownership. This had to have been done in the second half of the 1940s. At that time the actual—and not the administrative—collectivization of production was self-contained to a significant extent within the borders of the republic, while the national economy could not satisfy even essential requirements and received considerable assistance from other fraternal republics.

In light of the aforementioned, the attempts of the authors of the principles of republic economic accountability for the LaSSR to introduce the term “unified national-economic system of the republic” into academic circulation are incorrect in an academic regard.

The term “unified national-economic system of the republic” could be employed only toward the RSFSR, and possibly the UkSSR, out of the 15 republics that comprise the USSR. It is namely those republics that are basically able to provide for the process of reproduction through local sources of resources and the organization (if it were required) of technical production and economic ties within the republics. The more the republics are included in the system of the social division of labor, the stronger the national-economic system of the

country, the fewer the objective conditions for autarky and the less ruinous the policy of separatism for the peoples of the republics.

So we move on to the second constituent element of republic economic accountability—the implementation of an independent internal and external economic policy of the republic with the other union republics on the basis of equivalent exchange.

In accordance with Article 6 of the USSR Constitution, the CPSU determines the course of domestic and foreign policy and guides the creative activity of the Soviet people. Such a role for the CPSU clearly does not sit well with the authors of republic economic accountability, but then they must propose an alternative solution to see that some organization ensures the academic level of that policy and a regard for the interests of all social segments and ethnic groups residing on the territory of the republic. But there are as yet no such alternatives.

The equivalence of commodity exchange has long troubled the minds of economists and political scientists in the country. With the centralized distribution (allocation) of resources and the effective absence of actual wholesale trade in capital goods, however, to inveigh for equivalence of exchange signifies trying to gain advantages for oneself at the expense of others.

Equivalence can be obtained only in value terms, which assumes the correspondence of prices to socially essential expenditures. But there are no such prices, because there is not as yet a developed market for goods, labor, investments or stock. The creation of a developed market in the future is thus a most important problem. The development of market relations that can be regulated (basically by the tax system) will be an objective criterion for the functional efficiency of this or that form of socialist ownership. Prices will nearly always deviate from value until then. Wherein prices for energy resources and raw materials, as a rule, are lower than their actual value, which is very advantageous to the republic, and prices for finished products are higher.

Wholesale prices for a ton of petroleum today are five times lower than world prices. The average wholesale price for a ton of coal for various basins of the USSR is 65 percent below world levels. The wholesale prices for metal structural items, raw materials for light industry and non-ferrous metals are much lower than world prices. Our republic, importing (in percentage of consumption) 93 percent of fuel, 90 percent of ferrous metals and 100 percent of non-ferrous, 77 percent of chemicals and petrochemicals, 62 percent of machine building and metalworking products, 27 percent of the timber, woodworking and paper-and-cellulose, along with 40 percent of the light and 28 percent of the food industries¹³ and exporting finished products at higher wholesale prices, receives additional income. The balance of payments of the LaSSR, according to one calculation technique, has a positive net balance of almost a billion rubles a year.¹⁴

The economy that arises in exchange with other regions of the country has been used for many decades for the development of our republic social, cultural and consumer spheres. Today we live partly at the expense of the intensive physical and mental energy of workers employed in the extraction of fuel and power resources, the production of various types of metals and products of machine building, etc. The narrowness of the development of the social infrastructure in those regions was caused to a considerable extent by the fact that the low wholesale prices for their products did not allow making the development of the social sphere on their territory dependent on the results of their labor.

The data on the economic development of the republic for a longer period of time show that even with the prevailing difference in wholesale prices, the cost recovery [*samookupayemost*] of the republic is problematical. Over a quarter century (from 1960 through 1985) the gross social product in the Latvian SSR grew by 3.88 times and national income by 3.9 times, while capital investment grew by 4.23 times and fixed productive capital by 5.79 times.¹⁵ Whence it follows that the growth in fixed productive capital proceeded at more than the expense of republic resources alone. The difference could be covered only by resources coming in from outside the boundaries of the republic.

The authors of republic economic accountability are burning with the desire to incorporate it starting in January 1990 (how could we lag behind our neighbors!). But won't production in the republic be unprofitable in connection with the proposed rise in wholesale prices starting in January 1990? They will increase by 90 percent for coal, double for gas, 2.2 times for fuel oil, 2.3 times for petroleum as a raw material for fuel and chemical products, 25-30 percent for building materials and 40-55 percent for the rate scales for electric and thermal power.¹⁶ Wherein we must think that the proposed rise in wholesale prices will not be conclusive. Another one-time and no less sizable increase for those goods will obviously be required to make them equivalent to world price levels.

If you figure that it will be possible to compensate for losses through a rise in wholesale prices for output expressed as the items of consumption, disappointment awaits you.

The social sphere is of course more developed in this republic than in many others. The proportionate share of Group B in the value of all industrial products totals 43 percent,¹⁷ while it is an average of 24.4 percent across the USSR. The republic occupies first place among the other union republics in the production of non-productive goods per capita and second (after Estonia) in the production of foodstuffs. The rise in prices for consumption items in exchange among republics, however, will be limited by the fact that the other republics will naturally prefer to obtain higher-quality goods in the world market, the more so as the products of the light and food industries are cheaper in that market and

equipment, petroleum products, gas, ferrous metals, etc. are more expensive.¹⁸ It will be more advantageous for them to have access to the world market.

Finally, equivalent exchange is problematical under conditions of market relations when the degree of risk increases many times over. How will the republic be able to provide for a rise in production efficiency, a reduction in spending and an increase in product output when, first of all, the sufficiency of fixed capital in industry and construction, which produces more than half of the national income of the republic, totals 88 and 76 percent of the level across the USSR respectively,¹⁹ and second, when the obsolescence of that capital comprises 48 and 59 percent respectively,²⁰ while it totals an average of 40 percent across the USSR?

True, the capital-labor ratio is 51 percent higher in agriculture and 57 percent higher in transport and communications than the average for the country overall. The production volume of agricultural output, however, has increased by only 1.75 times from 1940 through 1987 due to irresponsibility and incompetent leadership, while it increased an average of 2.9 times for the country overall.²¹ Some republic leaders are complaining that many types of agricultural equipment do not correspond to the soil and climate conditions of the republic, but after all the picture is the same in other regions of the country as well, but they have been able to increase production volume much more in those regions anyway.

All of these data show that the theoretical, technical, organizational and economic foundation of the conversion of the republic to economic accountability and providing for cost recovery is too shaky.

It is clearly too early to be talking about republic economic accountability. The discussion can therefore proceed not on economic accountability for the republic, but rather—as was emphasized in the meeting of M.S. Gorbachev with workers in the city of Kiev—on “restructuring the leadership of the economy and the social sphere in the union republics... The main thing here is the conversion of all enterprises and associations, regardless of departmental affiliation, to complete economic accountability, self-financing and cost recovery and the establishment of economically substantiated relations between them and the republic and local budgets. The republic budget should have at its disposal its own sources of income based on long-term standards.”²² The discussion can thus proceed on a considerable expansion of administrative rights and economic responsibility of the union republic for the economic and social development of its territory.

Finally, the last component of the structural framework of republic economic accountability is a republic currency. There is no need to fan the emotions surrounding this issue by declaring this phenomenon to be unconstitutional. This issue is the fact that republic money is a

utopia that is directed backwards in thrust. Only command-administrative thinking could have been able to create this myth.

A fundamentally new economic phenomenon that has not existed in our country since the monetary reform of 1947 has appeared under the conditions of an expanding shortage of goods and the rapid growth of potential, deferred and unsatisfied demand—speculative foreign-currency demand has appeared. To speak of a republic currency under these conditions means to fail to understand that money becomes a universal equivalent only after it becomes a commodity the price of which depends on competitive market conditions.

Under conditions where the overall sum of money that has been issued to the population through various channels since the monetary reform of 1961 that has no commodity equivalent totals almost 250 billion rubles, any currency—checks, calling cards, photos, slats etc.—for which a commodity can actually be acquired becomes the object of buying and selling itself. And the higher the speculative demand, the higher the price of that “currency.”

The introduction of a republic “currency” will raise the nominal price of that “currency,” which will be a very strong blow to the consumption level of goods and services by the population of the republic. It would therefore be expedient for the authors of these ideas to focus their attention on developing measures to reduce shortages.

Today it is not the introduction of one's own currency that is needed, but rather the development of extraordinary measures for 1-2 years so as not to allow the augmentation of negative trends or a worsening of the economic and social situation. The development of measures defining an expansion of economic reform for “entry” into the 21st century is what is needed today, since a leap forward in quality and a transition to a fundamentally new system of five-year leadership of the economy unknown in the past and based entirely on the utilization of economic methods are required. A system of measures for the more distant future associated with the implementation of an economic restructuring of a structural and investment nature that has never before been pursued in the country is what is needed.

It follows from all of the above that the faster republic economic accountability is incorporated apropos of the current state of the economy of the republic and apropos of the level of theoretical, economic and political preparation of the personnel of republic administration, the more quickly a decline in the standard of living of all ethnic groups of the republic will occur.

Footnotes

1. “What Do the Statistics Say?” 2 December 1988.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.

4. KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII, No 6, 1989, p 30; SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH, 22 December 1988.
5. SOVETSKAYA LATVIA, 3 and 4 June 1989.
6. SOVETSKAYA LATVIA, 11 June 1988.
7. SOVETSKAYA LATVIA, 16 October 1988.
8. Ibid.
9. LaSSR Council of Ministers Decree of 31 October 1989 [as published].
10. "LaSSR in Figures for 1987." Concise Statistical Handbook. Riga, Goskomstat, 1988, p 3.
11. SOVETSKAYA LATVIA, 19 October 1988.
12. KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII, No 4, 1989, p 10.
13. KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII, No 4, 1989, p 10.
14. KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII, No 6, 1989, p 9.
15. SOVETSKAYA LATVIA, 5 February 1989.
16. PRAVDA, 27 February 1989.
17. "LaSSR in Figures for 1987." Concise Statistical Handbook. Riga, Goskomstat, 1988, p 9.
18. PRAVITELSTVENNIYY VESTNIK, No 12, 1989, p 10.
19. "LaSSR in Figures for 1987." Concise Statistical Handbook. Riga, Goskomstat, 1988, p 5.
20. KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII, No 7, 1988, pp 63-64.
21. KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII, No 7, 1988, pp 63-64.
22. EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA, No 9, 1989, p 3.